



Wayne State University

Wayne State University Dissertations

1-2-2012

An examination of midwest community college presidents' leadership styles

Marvin Jones Jacobs
Wayne State University,

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/oa_dissertations

 Part of the [Higher Education and Teaching Commons](#), and the [Other Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Jacobs, Marvin Jones, "An examination of midwest community college presidents' leadership styles" (2012). *Wayne State University Dissertations*. Paper 510.

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@WayneState. It has been accepted for inclusion in Wayne State University Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@WayneState.

**AN EXAMINATION OF MIDWEST COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS'
LEADERSHIP STYLES**

by

MARVIN JONES JACOBS

DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Graduate School

of Wayne State University,

Detroit, Michigan

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

2012

**MAJOR: EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
AND POLICY STUDIES**

Approved by:

Advisor

Date

© COPYRIGHT BY
MARVIN JONES JACOBS
2012
All Rights Reserved

DEDICATION

Humility is the genesis of self-actualization and
is a sword forged to battle hubris, haughtiness, and self-aggrandizement.
It is with humbleness I dedicate this dissertation to my many spirit guides
that were given to me by Almighty God.
They have always driven my heart, nerve, and sinew as I faced this challenge.
Praise goes to my late mothers and father,
Essie B. Jones, Elver Louise Jacobs, Arbel Jacobs,
and my beautiful wife, Bennie Jacobs;
who were all placed in my life as beacons of light on my personal sojourn.
I also dedicate this dissertation to my children,
Marvin Jones Jacobs II, Bianca Latice Jacobs (Eugene) and my son-in-law, Richard Eugene
who have always supported their dad with love, concern, and motivation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I see the term *to educate* as a process that affords a teacher the opportunity to create a safe educational haven for the learner. In this haven, knowledge is imported to the student without pre-conceived notions or judgments about the economic status or class of the learner. Education should be available to all and put forth with the intent of helping the learner move toward self-actualization. Through continued research, observations, and asking questions regarding our educational landscape, I have become enlightened. I have a vision of educational systems that will retain certain attributes of past paradigms while embracing and taking ownership of past and new educational theories, which have traction and may serve to solve some intractable problems that confronting our current educational landscape.

I have met many people along my journey of enlightenment, and I would like to acknowledge those who have helped me achieve my goal. I had a number of dissertation chairs along this journey. I would like to give a special thanks to my dissertation chair, Dr. Monte Piliawsky, for his knowledge, support, direction, judgment, and understanding. I would like to thank Dr. Frances LaPlante-Sosnowsky, for working in tandem with Dr. Piliawsky to get me to the point of completing this challenge. I would also like to thank Dr. Roger DeMont and Dr. Leon Warshay for their input as committee members with helping me in completing my research project.

Thanks to all the Midwest Community College Presidents who responded to my survey. Without their participation, this research project would not be possible and I will be forever grateful to them.

Special thanks to Ms. Michele Norris in the College of Education Instructional Technology for her unwavering support and cheerleading, which will never be forgotten. A very

special thanks to Mrs. June Cline for her direction, dissertation knowledge, passion, dedication, attention to detail, and intellectual acumen.

I would like to thank all the professors who I met along the way that provided advice. Special thanks to Dr. Lee Randall (deceased) for suggesting that I complete the EdSpc and later enroll in the Doctoral program. A special thanks to Dr. Donald Marcotte (deceased) who played an instrumental role in my successful completion of the EER courses. Also, thanks to Dr. Rita Richey for her input during my courses. Thanks go to Ms. Arlinda Pringle in WSU Career Services for her advice, laughs, and cheerleading. Thanks to Dr. Janice Green and Paul Johnson in the College of Education for their support and direction.

Throughout this journey, my family has given so much support, love, and put up with more than any would every know. My wife, Bennie, my son, Marvin, and my daughter, Bianca, have been with me all the way through this journey and I thank almighty God for putting them on my board of directors.

Thanks to all of you for your support and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dedication	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
List of Tables	viii
List of Figures	ix
CHAPTER ONE – INTRODUCTION	1
Background	1
Community Colleges	2
Purpose of Study	4
Research Questions	4
Significance of Study	5
Definitions of Terms	7
Assumptions	8
Limitations of the Study	8
CHAPTER TWO – LITERATURE REVIEW	9
Introduction	9
Leadership Theory	9
Evolution of Leadership	10
Suggested Elements of Organizational Leadership	19
Community College Presidents Leadership and Organizational Theory	20
Research on Administrative Perceptions of Leadership	21
The Community College	23
Community Colleges and Their Presidents	27

Community College Presidents Approaches to Leadership.....	32
Survey of Presidential Leadership Styles in Higher Education	35
Summary	39
CHAPTER THREE – METHODOLOGY	40
Introduction.....	40
Restatement of the Problem	40
Research Design.....	40
Participants.....	41
Instrumentation	41
Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire – Self-leader.....	41
Demographic Survey	45
Data Collection Procedures.....	45
Data Analysis	46
CHAPTER FOUR – RESULTS OF DATA ANALYSIS	49
Introduction.....	49
Description of Sample.....	49
Description of Scaled Variables.....	56
Research Questions	56
Research question 1	57
Research question 2	58
Research question 3	59
Summary	62
CHAPTER FIVE – SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	63

Summary	63
Methods.....	64
Findings.....	64
Conclusions.....	67
Implications for Practice	70
Recommendations for Further Study	70
Appendix A – Introduction Letter to Presidents	72
Appendix B – Instruments	73
Appendix C – Research Information Sheet	76
Appendix D – Human Investigation Committee Approval	78
References	79
Abstract	88
Autobiographical Statement.....	90

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Change in Ethnic Representation among Community College Presidents	28
Table 2	Presidential Types and Implicit Rules of Presidential Actions.....	37
Table 3	Scales and Subscales Measured on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.....	42
Table 4	Statistical Analysis.....	47
Table 5	Frequency Distributions – Personal Characteristics (N = 82)	50
Table 6	Frequency Distributions – Location of the Community College (N = 82)	51
Table 7	Descriptive Statistics – Personal Experiences in Higher Education	52
Table 8	Frequency Distributions – Previous Position Prior to Community College Presidency (N = 82)	53
Table 9	Frequency Distributions – Location of Previous Position (N = 82)	54
Table 10	Descriptive Statistics – Demographics of the Community College.....	55
Table 11	Descriptive Statistics – Multifactor Questionnaire Subscales	56
Table 12	Multivariate Analysis of Variance – Leadership Styles by Size of Student Body	57
Table 13	Descriptive Statistics – Leadership Styles by Size of Student Body	58
Table 14	Stepwise Multiple Linear Regression Analysis – Transformational Leadership Styles.....	59
Table 15	Stepwise Multiple Linear Regression Analysis - Passive Avoidant Leadership Styles.....	61

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1	Evolution of Leadership Theory	11
----------	--------------------------------------	----

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background

Community colleges are facing challenges, as baby boomers in leadership roles retire, creating leadership shortages and concurrent shifts in approaches to presidential leadership within the community college system (Evelyn, 2001). As a consequence, evolving presidential leadership styles may be a major factor in the survival of these educational systems. Community colleges may be confronting some critical organizational barriers in accomplishing their mission (Eddy & VanDerLiden, 2006). Community college leadership stakeholders have begun to recognize the need for more and better community college presidential leadership programs to train new leaders (Jeffery, 2008). In addition, community colleges struggle with pressing issues such as teacher shortages, swelling enrollments, budget cuts, student transfer ratios, and student population diversity, that require presidential leadership.

According to researchers (Boyd, 2002; Levine & Cureton, 1998), spending for higher education will be lagging relative to other state expenditures and access to these institutions is viewed as an entitlement. As minorities and under-prepared students' demands rise, services for these students have to be addressed, with these additional demands often placing substantial drains on scarce resources.

Literature suggests that leadership has historically been the provider of solutions to internal and external problems experienced by institutions of higher education (Bolman & Deal, 1992). As recently as the 1990s, leadership in these institutions appeared to be problematic throughout the United States (Green, 1994; MacTaggart, 1994; Maxcy, 1994). Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum (1989) purported that the long standing leadership practiced in higher education has changed from hierarchical, social control and highly structured models to non-

hierarchical and democratic forms of leadership practice. More precisely, these researchers suggest that higher education leadership has begun to move toward embracing “dynamic, globalized, and processed-oriented perspectives of leadership which emphasizes cross-cultural understanding, collaboration, and social responsibility for others” (p. 2).

Higher education has been criticized regarding its failure to apply leadership theory in managing and maintaining educational institutions (Tucker, et al., 1992). According to research on leadership styles, no clear conclusions have been reached regarding which specific leadership styles contribute to productivity within institutions of higher education (Ehrle & Bennett, 1988).

Community Colleges

The community college has a uniquely American heritage. Historically, this educational system has offered a variety of academic, career, and occupational choices to its student body. The community college system grew out of a 100-year-old junior college movement and has evolved into a comprehensive educational system. Community colleges seek to provide a bridge for aspiring transfer learners and occupational learners who are exploring career options (Floyd, 1992).

Community colleges are complex organizations with multifaceted issues and problems and are accountable to many constituents. Presidents of these institutions face a myriad of issues driven by their constituents. Stakeholders (e.g., trustees, staff, the community, local, state and the federal government officials) place many demands on the president. According to a study published by Iowa State University in 2007, community college presidents are simultaneously confronted with juggling scarce resources and addressing institutional policies, while providing excellent educational programs for students. The Iowa State study supported the idea that there appears to be an approaching leadership shortage within the community college system. The Iowa State University News Service reported on a study conducted by Duree (2007) who

surveyed 415 (38.2%) of community college presidents nationally. He found that 79% are expected to retire by 2012, with a total of 84% retiring by 2016. This study concluded that higher education resources are in short supply and state reductions in funding subject these presidents to expanded oversight and accountability.

Community colleges presidents provide a symbolic and visible brand, as well as define meaning for their institutions. These leaders are expected to embody and reflect the mission of their individual institutions and convey the symbolic ritualized content of the position that they hold. The responsibility for confronting community college institutional issues is the president's domain (Shak & Monahan 2008). According to Green and Levine (1985), leadership affords community college presidents with opportunities to move these institutions forward even in the face of adversity. They concluded that the presidency is more than a job or position but is a calling, steeped in a moral obligation to minister and provide a critical perspective.

In support of this position, DePree (1989) defined this perspective or moral obligation as a component of leadership. DePree asserted that, a leader has a primary responsibility to define reality. According to DePree presidential leaders are managers of meaning for the institutions that they lead. Kaufman (1980) posited that the person holding the position of president is at the center of a complex, fragile human organization. If the president is not successful, the institution suffers and the college cannot rise above the level of the president's leadership. Educational leadership literature suggested that the fate of community colleges and their presidents' leadership skills are inextricably intertwined.

Community colleges are facing an approaching leadership shortage and shift in how these presidents lead. The approaching leadership shortage within the community college system appears to be more profound than projections for four-year educational institutions (Evelyn, 2001; Schultz 2001; Weisman & Vaughan 2002). These researchers suggest that this projected

rapid exodus of community college presidents may present opportunities to provide fresh leadership, as these institutions face new and complicated demands from a variety of constituents. During these fluid times, community colleges may have opportunities to embrace new and emerging definitions of leadership (Evelyn, 2001).

Higher education literature suggested that emerging leadership styles are considered viable substitutes for replacing traditional views of hierarchical leadership styles used by community college presidents (Davis 2003). Eddy and VanDerlinden (2006) reported that alternative leadership styles are replacing traditionally held definitions of leadership among community college presidents and higher level administrators. Among some of the emerging leadership styles discussed in the literature are; contextual planning (Peterson, 1979), servant leadership (Greenleaf, 1977), transformative leadership (Burns, 1978), the web of inclusion (Helgesen, 2005), and in praise of followers (Kelly, 1998).

Purpose of Study

The projected shortage and exodus of experienced community college president drives the need to explore the leadership styles of current community college presidents. As warnings of this emerging shortage persist, relatively little attention has been given to considering what community college presidential leadership styles are important in the organizational context of the community college. The purpose of this study is to examine the leadership styles of the 176 Midwest community college presidents and chancellors in Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin.

Research Questions

The following research questions are addressed in this study:

1. Do leadership styles of Midwest community college presidents differ relative to the number of students enrolled in their community colleges?

2. Can Midwest community college presidents' leadership styles be predicted from college demographics (e.g., , number of administrative personnel, number of full-time and part-time faculty, number of students, and, geographic location)?
3. Can Midwest community college presidents' leadership styles be predicted from the president's personal and professional characteristics (e.g., gender, race, age, educational level, and longevity in the community college system)?

Significance of the Study

This study examines the leadership styles of presidents of community colleges in the Midwest area of the United States. Research literature suggest that community college presidents differ in their beliefs about leadership styles and because of the current and future challenges confronting community colleges, newly appointed presidents need to understand and be experienced in dealing with leadership issues. Based on differing perceptions about leadership and organization, their leadership roles and agendas are likely to be carried out differently.

Community college presidential candidates may find this study helpful as a resource when doing research on leadership theory and presidential leadership in community college organizational context. This study could be helpful in developing leadership training programs for new community college administrators, particularly for those community college administrators who aspire to the position of community college president. Research findings gleaned from this study may contribute to evidence that traditional models of leadership do not encompass the multiple ways that leadership is being practiced currently by community college presidents. Research suggests that top-down, autocratic leadership practices are not suited for the 21st century operation of community colleges (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989, p.2).

Literature has linked the leadership styles of community college presidents with faculty and community college boards' satisfaction and individual presidential performance in terms of

achievement and meeting institutional goals. The modern day community college has evolved into institutions that have begun to embrace “dynamic, globalized, and processed-oriented perspectives which emphasize cross-cultural understanding, collaboration, and social responsibility for others” (Bensimon et al., 1989). Contemporary philosophies such as democratic decision making, shared vision, and collaborative relationships appear to be more suited for today’s community colleges. These leadership philosophies appear to be related more closely to a transformational leadership style. This style seeks to inspire, motivate subordinates, promote teamwork, encourage decision making, and provide shared vision between leader and followers on the idea of what their institution can become.

The findings from this study may provide benefits to a variety of educational stakeholders. Community college leaders, boards, and trustees may garner new and relevant information on the characteristics of leadership that are most beneficial in candidates who are seeking to fill the position of president in their institutions. They may recognize that community college presidents lead in different ways at different times based on the need and challenges facing each community college. It may reinforce the idea that presidential leadership styles are important in the success of their institutions and also alert stakeholders to the importance of documenting valuable insight on successful leadership practices and behavior of the soon-to-be retired community college presidents.

Therefore, this study is important because it can provide another prism from which higher education stakeholders can view community college presidential leadership styles. Knowing and understanding leadership styles of community college presidents may greatly assist community college boards and trustees in selecting leaders that may best meet their institutional goals and sustainability.

Definitions of Terms

Community Colleges	Postsecondary institutions that provide associate degrees, certificates, and career/technical/occupational training, as well as prepare students to transfer to baccalaureate degree granting institutions (Eddy & VanDerliden (2006).
Leadership	A process practiced by an individual to influence a group of individuals to reach a mutually determined goal (Hersey & Blanchard 1974).
Leadership Style	The manner in which the leader influences subordinates as perceived by the presidential leader and measured by the (MLQ) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio 1993).
Ideal “type”	A means of interpreting and gaining perspective on leadership type (Weber 1949).
President	The CEO of a single college campus or one who leads a single or multi-campus system.
Chancellor Chief	Administrative officer of a single college campus or one who leads a single or multi-campus system.
Presidential Type	A tool for analyzing presidential thinking about leadership at any given moment (Neumann & Bensimon, 1990).
Transformational Leadership	Leadership that focuses on developing mutual trust, fostering leadership abilities of others, and establishing goals that extend beyond the short-term needs of the work group (Bass, 1979).
Transactional Leadership	Leadership that focuses on role and task requirement and uses rewards contingent on performance (Burns, 1970).

Passive-Avoidant Leadership	Management by exception. Leader devotes time to investigating only those situations when actual results of a project or goal differs substantially from planned results.
--------------------------------	--

Assumptions

The following assumptions are being made for this study:

- Community college presidents symbolize the institutions that they lead and give meaning to their constituency.
- Community college presidents are responsible for confronting issues within their community college and recognize their responsibility in moving the institution forward.

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations are recognized for this research study:

- The study is limited to community college presidents in Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Wisconsin.
- This study is limited to presidents who are in their positions in community colleges at the time of the study.
- General limitations in this study are similar and common to most survey research studies, such as limited control over response rates from participants (Fowler, 1989).

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This research project will investigate the leadership style of community college presidents in five states (Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Wisconsin) and determine how these presidents self-report their leadership styles. The review of related literature briefly explores leadership theory development, dimensions of leadership and organizational theory, organizational leadership in community college, and community college presidential leadership styles. A summary of literature on leadership styles of community college presidents will also be illustrated.

Leadership Theory

The prevailing characteristics that identify effective presidential leadership within the discipline of education have been the focus of earlier studies (Birnbaum, 1992). Leadership is a complex phenomenon that may present a variety of conundrums for scholars and researchers alike, as they attempt to analyze and understand the leadership process and its theoretical underpinnings. While no single definition describes effective community college presidential leadership, several leadership theories have been developed. Stodgill (1974) posited that there are as many definitions of leadership as there are people attempting to define the term. People know what the word means intuitively, as leadership has different meanings for each person. Over the past 50 years, as many as 65 different leadership classification systems have been proposed. These systems have been developed to define the dimensions of leadership (Fleishman et al. 1991). Bass and Bass (2008) found that over 8,000 books and articles have been written on the topic of leadership and Bass (1997) suggested that leadership is a combination of special traits or characteristics that an individual possesses that enable them to persuade others to

accomplish tasks. Still other definitions of leadership have indicated that it is an act or behavior that leaders use to initiate change in a group.

Evolution of Leadership

Northouse (2004) defined leadership as both an art and a science. An analysis of the theoretical leadership tree illustrated that leadership theory has roots anchored in multiple disciplines, such as: social psychology, (behaviorism, cognitive, and psychoanalytical), organizational behavior, business management theory, literature and anthropology. Figure 1 provides a graphical interpretation of the evolution of leadership from the great man theory (Carlye, 1840) through transformational leadership theory (Bass & Avilo, 1993).




Figure 1: Evolution of Leadership Theory

Note: This figure is a compilation of several theorists, as listed on the figure.

Northouse (2004) opined that despite the multitude of conceptualizations of leadership, four central components of the leadership phenomenon include: (a) leadership is a process; (b) leadership involves influence, (c) leadership occurs, and (d) it involves goal attainment.

Throughout the history of leadership development, leadership theory has evolved through five major generations that include: (a) trait (Allport, 1937; Stodgill, 1974), (b) contingency (Fiedler, 1964) and situational (Bass, 1990), (c) behavior (Stodgill, 1974), (d) transactional (Burns, 1978) and (e) transformational (Bass & Avilo, 1993). These five theories share common qualities and are considered classical models of leadership. They are neither mutually exclusive nor exhaustive, with many of the theoretical concepts overlapping. Leaders often need to employ more than one theory to be effective. The five theoretical models have dominated leadership research at different points in time.

Trait Theories. Trait theories, in the context of the five classic models of leadership, grew to prominence first and became the pre-eminent theory of dominance in defining leadership. A precursor of the trait leadership theory was the great man theory (Carlyle, 1840). This theory was based on the study of people who were already leaders and were descendants of aristocrats. The great man theory attempted to explain history by relating it to the impact of great men of the time. This theory suggested that in every age a few superior individuals arise to give direction to the masses as a result of their charisma, intellect, inheritance, and class. Class was a defining factor in assigning the label of leader and subsequently few from the lower classes were given opportunities to lead. The nineteenth century philosopher and historian, Thomas Carlyle, is most commonly associated with this theory and frequently referred to it in his lecture, “The Hero the King” (Carlyle 1840). The tenets of this theory supported the concept that leadership was associated with breeding. Gender issues were not considered during the prominence of the great man theory and the thought of great women was generally in areas other than leadership. Galton

(1869) examined great men from the perspective of heredity after observing how frequently ability seemed to be determined by lineage and not by other attributes.

In terms of the evolution of leadership research, Jennings (1960) believed that the future hero would be an individual with the mission to overcome obstacles who would be able to recognize that struggle begins not with his community, not even with his family but rather begins with himself. The great man theory provided a frame of reference for looking back at early leadership theory. Trait theory operated on the assumption that people are born with inherited traits, and some of these traits were particularly suited for leadership. Trait theory replaced the ideas about the great man theory and to some degree expanded the inclusion of more people who could become great leaders.

Stodgill (1974) identified traits and skills that could be important to those who aspired to become leaders. Stodgill suggested that leaders must be adaptable in multiple situations. They need to be alert to social environments, ambitious, achievement driven, assertive, cooperative, and decisive, while retaining a tolerance for stress. He thought that leaders needed to possess skills that reflected intelligence, conceptualization, creativity, diplomacy and tact, persuasiveness, and organizational skills, as well as able to administrate effectively. Stodgill (1974) explored what differentiates leaders from non-leaders:

- Trait leadership suggests that certain individuals have special innate or inborn characteristics or qualities that make them leaders; and these traits differentiate those leaders from non-leaders.
- Qualities used to identify leaders include; physical factors, personality features, extroversion, ability characteristics, and speech fluency.

Trait leadership is quite different than process leadership, with trait conceptualizing leadership as a set of properties. This theory suggested that leadership traits are present in select

people and leadership is restricted to those who are believed to have special, usually inborn talents. Conversely, leadership, as a process, indicated that it was a phenomenon that resided in the context and opens leadership to everyone.

Behavioral theory of leadership evolved from disenchantment with the trait approach to leadership. In the 1950s, the leadership focus shifted from leader traits to leader behavior. The premise of this stream of research was that leaders' behaviors were more important than their physical, mental, or emotional traits (Stodgill, 1974). This behavioral approach to leadership began to supplement the follower-centric approach. This theory drew upon the fields of psychology, sociology and cultural anthropology promulgated by theorist such as Maslow's hierarchy of needs (1954), McGregor's motivational XY theory (1960), Rogers' humanistic psychology (1980), Lewin's organizational development (1958) and Agryis and Schon's learning organizations (1992). These theories redefined supervisor roles and coaches who were concerned about workers' self-actualization.

Seminal moments in the history of behavior leadership theories revolved around two famous research studies on behavioral leadership that took place at The Ohio State University and the University of Michigan in the late 1950s. The Ohio State studies used the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) that was originally administered to military personnel, employees in manufacturing companies, college students, and administrative student leaders (Stogdill & Coons, 1957). The study concluded that two distinct aspects of leadership, termed considerations and initiating structure, can be used to describe how leaders carry out their role.

Termed considerations, in relation to leadership style, are the polyvoiced leaders who are people oriented, participative, and somewhat transformational in leadership style. In contrast, the initiating structured leader directs with a transactional and task-oriented style. According to

Fleishman et al. (1991), the Ohio State studies were the catalyst for the juxtaposition of the Scientific Management and Human relations movement. The study concluded that termed considerations and initiating structure are independent dimensions, although they function simultaneously.

The Michigan State study initiated by Likert (1932) investigated the principles and methods of leadership that could be used to improve productivity and job satisfaction. The study concluded that two general behaviors emerged regarding leadership: (a) leadership employee orientation and (b) production orientation. Likert's (1961) research concluded that employee orientation generally worked to improve production that was more effective than close supervision. Likert eventually developed the four systems of management that were based on these earlier studies. He describes the four systems of management as (a) exploitative-authoritative, (b) benevolent-authoritative, and (c) consultative, and (d) participative group (Likert, 1961).

Situational theories, the next generation of leadership theories, addressed challenges that time-focused situations have on leadership. One point of situational theory asserts that only situational factors determines who will lead, which may be as extreme as the great man theory. According to Bass and Bass (2008), situational theory focused on the synchronicity between key historical events and situations that were evident at the time those events occurred. Bass and Bass noted that situational leaders perceive that a great leader emerges relative to time, location, and conditions. Documentation on situational leadership goes as far back as the Roman Empire and provides many insights into the state of affairs that drove situational leaders.

Bass and Bass, 2008) referred to research on situational leaders and the work of Munford (1909) and Hocking (1924). This research was more representative of key foundational tenets that formed the core of situational leadership. According to Bass and Bass (2008), these

researchers demonstrated that social conditions and their associated obstacles were factors that determined which skill set was required of a leader to meet situational challenges.

Within the nature of situational leadership, the leader is the catalyst for implementing solutions. For these leaders to be effective, leadership must flow from the bottom up and from the top down. Situationist leadership solves the inherent problems associated with the great man theory; it is more forward looking as situational factors can be seen in advance and may account for why some leaders appear to be great after they have achieved a place of legitimate power. In the context of leadership theory evolution, the great man theory and situational theories are perceived as two extremes of leadership theory.

The situational and contingency theories appear to meet at a theoretical intersection in terms of leadership decision making and style. The contingency theory examined the effectiveness of leadership in a given leadership decision, proposing that the organizational or work group context influenced the extent to which given leader traits and behaviors can be effective. The contingency leadership model gained prominence during the decade of the 1960s and 1970s. Three well-known contingency theories that became dominant during this leadership stream include: Fiedler's (1964) contingency theory, Stodgill's (1974) situational model and Vroom and Jago's (1974) decision-making model of leadership. Fiedler's contingency theory was the first to specify how situational factors interact with leader traits and behavior to influence leadership effectiveness. A contingency theory suggests that the "favorability" of the situation determines the effectiveness of task-and person-oriented leader behavior (Bass & Bass, 2008).

Contingency theory suggests that a leader's effectiveness depends on how well the leader's style fits the context. The most recognized contingency theories were developed by Fiedler (1964; 1984) and Fiedler and Garcia (1987). Fiedler's work has spanned more than 40

years, starting in the 1950s. These theories use a leader-match concept that tries to match leaders to appropriate situations. According to Dunham (1984), Fiedler believed that the effectiveness of a leader is “determined by the degree of match between a dominant trait of the leader and either relationship-oriented or task oriented” (p. 25). The contingency theory implied that personal ability is suited to specific types of task and if leaders or to be successful they must either match their personal traits to the task or adapt the tasks to fit their personality traits. Fiedler developed his theory by studying the styles of many different leaders who worked in different contexts; (primarily military organizations).

Contingency theories suggest that situations can be characterized by assessing three factors:

- Leader-member relations;
- Task structure; and
- Position power

Fiedler’s research produced the theory of the Least Preferred Co-worker (LPC). He developed the LPC scale that measured these three situational factors to determine the favorableness of various leadership styles in organizational situations. The contingency theory posits that certain leadership styles can be effective in specific situations, with the LPC approach depending on a combination of the three factors.

In research literature regarding the five major leadership theories, transformational leadership is among the most recent group of leadership theories being used in organizational settings. Transformational leadership is a theoretical attempt to explain leadership by relating it to the multiplicity of previous research literature. This theory focuses on the ability of groups to take responsibility for transcending personal self-interest and suggested a focus on the needs of the task. Bass (1990) found that, “Followers are converted into leaders” (p. 53) when

transformational leadership is at the center of a leaders' decision-making process. Bennis (1990) was among leadership theorists contributing to the discourse on transformational leaders. He further contributed to the mounting evidence that transformational leaders were able to enhance subordinates' job satisfaction and effectiveness by combining leadership strategies and methods.

In research completed by Burns (1978) and Bass and Bass (2008), an observation was made regarding the existence of a difference between transactional and transformational leadership. Transformational leadership theories of leadership emerged in the 1970s and focused on the importance of a leaders' charisma to leadership effectiveness. Theories, such as House's (1977) theory of charismatic leadership and Bass' transformational charismatic leadership, are prominent within the transformational leadership movement. A commonality exists between these theories, as they all focus on attempting to explain how leaders can accomplish extraordinary things against extreme odds. Emphases are placed on the importance of leaders' ability to articulate a clear and compelling vision, while inspiring subordinates' admiration, dedication, and unquestioned loyalty (Bass & Bass, 2008).

In contrast to the transformational leader, the transactional leader focuses on role and task requirement and uses rewards, contingent upon performance. Further examination of the transformational leader reflects their focus on developing mutual trust, fostering leadership abilities of others, and establishing goals that extend beyond the short-term needs of the work group. Bass (1997) asserted that transformational leaders typically exhibit four qualities; (a) charisma, (b) inspiration, (c) intellectual stimulation, and (d) consideration. Leaders who possess these qualities seek to inspire subordinates to be high achievers and put the long-term interest of the organization ahead of their own short-term interest.

Transformational leaders attempt to guide, motivate, and establish goals by classifying role and task requirements. These types of leaders have been the subject of considerable

scholarly leadership research, with Burns (1978) recognizing that the focus of such research should be on leadership rather than leaders. He stated that the hierarchies' of motivation of both leaders and followers shape the reciprocal relationship between the two stakeholders. Leadership is a process, not a person, an activity fused together through the motivation of both the leader and the follower. The development and recognition of many leadership models in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries have failed to identify a perfectly compatible model of leadership practice that fits all situations at all time.

Examining past and present leadership theories provides support that contemporary leadership models may be more compatible with the complex issues and problems being experienced by leaders in higher education and particularly community college. However, each theory reviewed is unique and brings a unique perspective and effectiveness to bear on situations, educational cultures, and organizational structures.

Suggested Elements of Organizational Leadership

Demand and performance requirements facing presidents and chief executive officers (CEO) in community colleges are imperatives that must be met for these leaders' and their institutions to achieve their goals. Zaccaro and Kilmoski (2001) suggested central elements that could be used to describe organizational leadership that were supported by (Bass, 1990; Stogdill, 1974; Yukl, 1994). Zaccaro and Klimoski (2001) attempted to synthesize the community of leadership theories into a consensus of the literature to provide a unifying perspective of leadership. Their unification perspective theorizes that:

- Organizational leadership is a process which results in proximal outcomes in terms of worker commitment to the goals of the leaders and the followers in the context of the organizational purpose.

- Organizational leadership is manifested by the degree of non-routine influences that occur in organizational life.
- Influence of the leader is determined by a cognitive, social and political process.
- Inherently organizational leadership is contextually defined and caused.

Community College Presidents' Leadership and Organizational Theory

Zacarro and Klimoski (2001) asserted that leadership has been a major topic of research for almost a century. Thousands of empirical and conceptual studies on the subject of leadership have emerged from that research. Much of the literature ignored the cognitive, interpersonal, and social aspects of leadership from the organizational context that may help to explain or account for outcomes. Model building in strategic management literature typically has focused on the higher levels of the organization but failed to explore insights regarding the selection, development, and training of new leaders. When these insights are offered, they often are not grounded in strong conceptual frameworks with sufficient empirical support. The lack of progress in developing an integrated approach to organizational leadership is reflected when theorists offer generic leadership theories that use many similar constructs in explaining leadership. This approach operates under the assumption that leadership at the top reflects the same psychological and sociological dynamics as leadership at lower organizational levels. These methods and other considerations have resulted in limited empirical research on organizational leadership and context.

According to Zaccaro and Klimoski (2001), many scholars have argued for studying leadership from a qualitative perspective. These arguments have been supported in previous research literature (Day & Lord, 1988; Hunt, 1981; Jacobs & Jacques, 1987; Katz & Kahn 1978). These scholars take a dimensional view of organizational structure, specifically at the hierarchical level. This view supported the contention that performance demands on leaders

change across organizational levels, resulting in different consequences as a result of leadership imperatives (Zacarro & Klimoski, 2001).

Research on Administrative Perceptions of Leadership

A longitudinal assessment conducted at American Telephone & Telegraph (AT&T; Bray, 1982; Bray, Campbell & Grant, 1974; Howard & Bray, 1988) investigated leader development to identify managerial characteristics that could be used to predict career effectiveness. This study concluded that an apparent link existed between executive performance and organizational success. According to Wenrich (1980), college presidents' most important function was to support and maintain institutional integrity through their own ethical behavior. Parnell (1989) argued, "The community college president has no more important task than that of continuously clarifying and emphasizing the mission of the community college" (p. 44).

Neumann and Bensimon (1990) conducted a comparative study on college presidents' images of their leadership styles. The study asserted that college presidents differed in their belief about what a college organization is and how leadership for the institution should be separated. College presidents' concept of organization and leadership is directed explicitly to certain aspects of leadership theory and away from others. These presidents' personal theories about organizational life and their role in the organization simultaneously guide and delimit their focus (i.e., what they see, hear, sense and how they interpret perceptions and respond to them; Birnbaum, 1988). Because of their perceptions about leadership and the organizational world, community college presidents' agendas are likely to be carried out differently.

According to Neumann and Bensimon (1990), some community college presidents are guided by their personal theory of leadership that requires them to create a bureaucratic structure. Other presidents may give attention to displaying charismatic influence, building coalitions, or building human communities. While presidents have diverse personal theories about

organizations and leadership, they are likely to believe certain elements of the presidents' role are preferable to others. Many presidents' decisions are driven by specific interpretive schemes (Neumann & Bensimon 1990). Neumann and Bensimon's study explored and identified patterns of how college presidents interpret what they do, while considering their personal theories. Their study sought to determine if community college presidents' knowledge, assumptions, and actions were driving forces behind their decision making. A major focus of the study considered the nature of the presidents' personal theories and schemes in light of their influence on the life of the organization. The researchers revealed that objective and subjective realities existed within the development and study of leadership. Leadership has been historically viewed in terms of traits or qualities that effective leaders exhibit in power relationships, as well as the influence and dynamics existing between leaders and followers. This perspective on leadership characteristics is much of what is regarded as college presidents' desirable traits.

Contemporary administrative and leadership studies have expanded the traditional perspective of leadership. Neumann and Bensimon (1990) purported that leadership is not viewed as a purely external, physical, and behavioral phenomenon, but conversely it is viewed as a more complex activity. According to Schon (1983), the knowing and assuming related to personal theories that are embedded in leaders' actions that Neumann and Bensimon spoke of become as important as the action itself. Recent studies in higher education indicated that leadership theorists have started to consider the more subjective side of leadership when attempting to define leadership within higher education. Neumann focused on the nature of this change from a traditional view of leadership to one that was subjectively derived and situational. Neumann and Bensimon (1990) supported research by Peterson (as cited in Neumann & Bensimon, 1990) and is manifested in leadership theory in general and higher education specifically.

The Community College

The community college evolved from at least seven sources of educational innovation, with two of these sources emerging between the 1880s and 1890s: (a) community boosterism and (b) the rise of the research university. Three sources came from educational reforms of the Progressive Era (1900 to 1916). (c) The advent of universal education, (d) the professionalization of teacher education, and (e) the vocational movement. The final two sources, (f) open access to higher education and (g) the rise of adult and continuing education as community service, developed after 1916. These seeds of innovation can be found in the earliest junior college (Baker, 1994).

Community colleges serve a vital role in transforming education in the United States. Weisman and Vaughn (2002) reported that community colleges play a vital role in post-secondary education. They serve almost half of the undergraduate students in the United States and provide a gateway for many students who are planning to transfer to baccalaureate institutions. Additionally, community colleges offer workforce development and job skills training. Weisman and Vaughn pointed to globalization as a major reason for the need to have an educated workforce, with a majority of the jobs created by 2014 requiring some post secondary education. Community colleges offer millions of students and adult learners' access to the education needed to compete in the work place.

According to American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), 987 public, 155 independent, and 31 tribal community colleges are providing post-secondary education in the United States. The state of Michigan has a total of 34 community colleges, with 43 presidents and chancellors; with Ohio home to 38 community colleges; Indiana has 5 community colleges with 19 presidents; Illinois has 56 community colleges; and Wisconsin has 20 community colleges.

The missions of community colleges are described in terms of multiple functions: student services, career education, developmental education, and community education, as well as transfer, liberal and general education (Cohen Brawer, 2003). Similarly, Vaughan (1986b) listed seven defining characteristics of the public community college: (a) public support, (b) open access, (c) commitment to teaching, (d) identified service area, (e) community-based programs, (f) comprehensive programs, and (g) support services. Vaughan (1986b) analyzed multiple mission statements of community colleges, concluding that their missions focused on: (a) formal education; (b) student services and counseling; (c) continuing education, including noncredit courses; (d) community service; (e) attention to students, including adults of all ages, women and minorities, the educationally and economically disadvantaged, disabled students; and (f) economic development (Vaughan, 1986b).

According to Weisman and Vaughn (2002), the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) created an institutional issues list that highlighted a cross-section of important issues affecting community colleges:

1. Leadership
2. Economic development
3. Homeland security
4. Instruction
5. Technology
6. Student development
7. Teaching and learning
8. Community building
9. Inclusiveness.

Of particular interest on their list of issues is leadership, which may determine the success or failure of the other eight institutional issues facing community colleges.

According to Myers (2012) in the *On Campus Magazine*, a national publication of American Federation of Teachers AFT), currently community colleges face a difficult combination of enrollment and budgetary funding constraints that threaten the quality of education. Indeed, availability of class space in community colleges across the United States relative to the demands of students has become so extreme that in California, as many as 250,000 potential students were unable to enroll in Fall Semester, 2011. Similarly, tuition at these institutions has dramatically increased. For example the state of New York, tuition at the City University of New York increased by \$300.00 for each student to fill state funding gaps.

As a result of funding gaps created by decreased state funding, community college staff are forced to cancel services such as: student career and clinical counseling, athletics and summer student enrichment programs. Community colleges have increased online assignments in an effort to save money. These budgetary constraints place severe financial burdens on many students attending the colleges.

Historically, community colleges have been educational way stations and starting lines for a great number of middle class and low-income students who seek a path to four-year institutions, or training to obtain defined job skills. Community colleges serve multiple roles for students including: earning a degree, graduating, transferring to baccalaureate institutions, improving jobs skills, changing careers, and enrolling in continuing education courses. Community colleges particularly play an important role as learning centers to provide skills training programs and post-secondary education for middle and lower-income students. President Obama recently defined community colleges as “promising incubators,” that serve to strengthen the country economically and create a viable work-force.

Barnette (as cited in Myers, 2012), chief of staff for the Cook County College Teachers Union in Chicago, asserted that as the economy becomes less robust, community colleges enrollment increases, with newly out of work students seeking additional career training and the development of new job skills. The American Association of Community Colleges (AACC, 2010) reported that community colleges enrollment dropped by 3.2% in 2010, but experienced a substantial increase of 11% in 2009. In 2007 and 2008, enrollment rose 17%. The enrollment in the Fall Semester of 2010 was 8.2 million students. According to the AACC, community colleges typically enroll approximately 44% of all undergraduates in nonprofit education institutions (American Community College 2010).

Unfortunately, research on the state of community colleges suggested that they lack necessary funding to support their increased enrollments. The Delta Cost Project report, “Trends in College Spending 1999-2009,” reported that “community colleges bore the brunt’ (Myers, 2012), p.9) of cuts in higher education across the United States. Barnette (as cited in Myers, 2012), added, “I don’t think there has been a raise in the community college budget since about 2005” (p.9). As the trend toward lower property values and decreases in state tax collections continues, community colleges and other state –funded educational institutions have increased tuition and implemented institutional cuts across the board. To illustrate, community college students, who attended the City University of New York free of charge until the 1970s have experienced substantial tuition increases.

The AACC reported that 86 of 267 community colleges found it impossible to enroll every eligible student because of “inadequate financial support, limited physical capacity and insufficient staff” (Myers, 2012, p. 9). Mulchay (as cited in Myers, 2012), president of Minnesota State College, points out that despite state legislation agreeing to pay 67% of

community college costs, the reality is that student tuition covers 60% of the cost and the state contributes only 40%.

According to Friedlander (as cited in Myers, 2012), president of California Federation of Teachers (CFT) Community College Council, “It’s very scary. It’s really the whole higher education system falling apart from these pressures” (p.9). Friedlander observed that for many years, students could not find all the classes they needed, and conversely now they face the reality that they cannot enroll in any classes as they attempt to complete their programs. Kelly-Brennan (cited in Myers, 2012), a health professor at the City College of San Francisco, attempts to save money by using handouts to save students the expense of buying expensive textbooks. A report from the Delta Cost Project listed other shortcuts that many schools have used to sustain themselves in a wavering economy, including deferred maintenance; reduced administrative salaries; cuts in research, public service, institutional support, information technology and public safety.

Community Colleges and Their Presidents

Cohen and Brawer (2003) acknowledged that the span of research time between the establishment of the first junior college in 1901 (Joliet Illinois) to the modern day community college of the 1960s has been short. This 60-year span has not allowed for an accumulation of research on the progression and evolution of community colleges and their presidents. The 1940s and 1950s propelled these leaders and their institutions to move toward independence from secondary education systems and seek their own identities. The 1960s and 1970s brought on the present day identity of the community college president. This new identity reflected a strong and dominant leadership that was necessary to manage the complex nature of the community college. During this stage of development, community colleges began to operate on a business-based model and began to emphasize efficiency and strategic planning (Rowley & Sherman, 2001).

A 2006 research brief in the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), executive summary by Weisman and Vaughan (2006) focused on trends of community college presidents in 2006. Weisman and Vaughan surveyed community college presidents and found that of the 545 presidents who responded to the survey, 88.0% were White and male, 71% were older than in previous surveys, 57% were 58 years of age or older, and 62% had been in their positions as president in excess of five years or more.

This 2006 survey reflected changes in demographic characteristics since the 2004 survey. In regard to gender, three previous surveys reflected increases in the percentage of women community college presidents from 11% in 1991 to 24% in 2001. The 2006 survey brought this percentage up to 29%. Weisman and Vaughan (2006) classified race/ethnicity using six categories: Caucasian, African American, Hispanic/Latino, American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian American/Pacific Islander, and other. The authors' pointed out that the majority of community college presidents continue to be Caucasian (88.0%), with African Americans (6%), Hispanic/Latino (4%), Asian American/Pacific Islander (1%), and less than 1% each American Indian/Alaskan Native and other.

Table 1

Change in Ethnic Representation among Community College Presidents

Ethnicity	2004	2006*	Change
African American	8.7	6.0	-2.7
Asian American	1.5	1.0	-0.5
Caucasian	80.1	88.0	7.9
Hispanic	6.8	4.0	-2.8
Native American	1.8	0.0	-1.8
Other	1.1	1.1	0.0

Note: Adapted from AACC, 2004, 2006
Percents do not equal 100% due to rounding

According to Amey and VanDerLinden (2002) of the AACC, 87% of the community college presidents held a doctorate. The appointment to the presidency of a community college was most often from provost at the same community college (37%), president of another community college (25%), and senior academic affairs/instructional officer (15%). Twenty-two percent of community college presidents were promoted from within their own institutions, while 67% were from other community colleges.

Vaughan (1986a) profiled leaders of two-year institutions, with his profile highlighting four major qualities for prototypical community college presidents: (a) integrity, (b) judgment, (c) courage, and (d) concern. During the 1980s, community college presidents and other higher education stakeholders were beginning to discuss the role of subordinates and relationship building. Vaughan's research later moved beyond highlighting personal descriptions and presidential traits to viewing presidents as architects and builders, to describing them as leaders with a vast range of responsibilities and duties.

Earlier support for Vaughan's (1986a) research came from Bass (1985) and Burns (1978) who supported the idea that transformational leaders were concerned with advancing followers' goals and beliefs to change the goals that ultimately can impact an organization's mission and its success. The transformational leader, in turn, helps followers to understand and take ownership of the leader's vision. Researchers (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978) transferred theories about transformational leaders from business leaders to the leadership role of community college presidents. Roueche, Baker, and Rose (1989) developed a leadership model to examine community college leaders who were exhibiting transformational behavioral attributes. Roueche et al. identified five themes for analysis of the transformational leader. These leaders:

1. believe in teamwork and decision-making;
2. value people both as-members of the team and as individuals;

3. understand motivation;
4. have strong personal value systems; and
5. have a vision of what their college can become

These researchers concluded that transformational leaders, particularly community college presidents, are effective when they empower their followers (Roueche et al., 1989).

During the 1990s, new problems arose for community colleges, specifically in the form of scarce economic resources, student composition, and the need to expand program development based on enrollment. These problems presented a compelling need for community colleges to identify a different kind of community college president. Confronted by these needs, community colleges advocated for cultural leadership that was congruent with the demanding nature of community colleges (O'Bannon, 1997). Cultural leadership is defined as leaders emphasizing team building, shared decision making, and shared problem solving. Baker (1992) supported the idea that cultural leadership may be better suited for recognizing the interdependence that exists within individual community colleges. Baker asserted that community college presidents help to create meaning for their followers in a given cultural context; this idea is at the central core of cultural leadership.

As community colleges moved toward the twenty-first century, they began to embrace the concept of the learning college. This conceptual shift called for a change toward shared leadership as an organizational leadership model. Gratton (1993) indicated that this organizational concept was manifested by embracing organizational learning among leaders/followers, with all members encouraged to share leadership. The major discernible indication of shared leadership was shared governance (Gratton, 1993). Lucey (2002) encouraged expansion of the shared leadership concept. Shared governance defined the role of faculty and administrators as two different and separate actions, with faculty members

responsible for academic and curricula issues and administrators accountable for institutional strategies and resource allocation.

Researchers (Gratton, 1993; Lucey, 2002) supported the concept of shared leadership that included both leaders and followers, and held them accountable for organizational success. The idea of shared leadership in community colleges recognized the importance of both leaders and followers working in tandem to achieve organizational goals (Lewis, 1989). A shift has occurred in leadership philosophy and practice from the early multitasking community college manager to a leader who emphasizes communications, restructures organizational reporting, and calls for accountability. This change in leadership marked a clear differentiation between presidential managers and presidential leaders.

Lewis (1989) suggested that community college presidents, at one time, were the primary decision makers within the community college system. However, as community colleges evolved, new leadership models developed and those were put into practice. According to Lewis, community colleges have begun to use a participatory decision-making organizational model. In their leadership roles, community college presidents are confronted with many important internal and external issues. They have been mandated to develop and nurture political and social network relationships, establish collaborative programs, and improve post-secondary education. Community college presidents also are expected to fulfill the missions of their institutions and retain approval from their trustees, while simultaneously pursuing and maintaining fundraising sources. Community college presidents routinely work collaboratively with lawmakers, while confronted with improving student completion rates and meeting retention goals.

There are many expectations' weighing on the community college president and their leadership style may be the engine that drives these leaders to achieve not only personal but institutional effectiveness. Community college presidents are faced with the challenge of

developing a vision for their colleges and they are responsible for mapping a route to institutional success, stability and viability. In many states, community colleges and their presidents' are expected to succeed where other educational systems have failed, and community college presidents' leadership style may be critical in meeting public and institutional expectations (Lewis, 1989).

Community College Presidents' Approaches to Leadership

Current literature provided evidence that community colleges and presidential leadership approaches have undergone changes to align with the dynamic fluidity and challenges facing modern day community colleges. In support of that reality, Vaughan (1989) asserted that the public view of community college presidents has made a metamorphosis over the past 30 years. Vaughan suggested that these observable changes came from a need to keep in step with the changes and demands facing modern community colleges. Changes in community college presidential leadership styles suggested that traditional and familiar leadership models moved from the rigid, take-charge leader (associated with the great man leadership approach) to a transactional-transformational style of leadership. Vaughan (1986a) 1989) postulated that with each new generation of community college presidents, leadership styles moved closer to a participatory and shared-decision making style. Evolution of community college presidential leadership styles appeared to have been driven, and continues to be driven, by internal and external necessity.

Community college presidents throughout the United States are beginning to plan for their retirements. A group of retiring presidents shared their suggestions to incoming community college presidents at an Annual Convention of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) that honored the retiring presidents in 2011. According to Ashford (2011) in the *Community College Times Magazine*, the soon-to-be retirees' recommended that these new

presidents maintain positive relationships with their new colleagues and maintain their focus on student needs.

Lott, a retiring president who served as president of Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College, suggested that new presidents create a circle of people with excellent leadership skills to serve on their team, have a strategic plan to share with their new team members, and delegate out a good amount of tasks. These suggestions parallel the findings presented in research literature on leadership styles of community college presidents. Lott advised new community college presidents to engage community leaders in businesses and industries in the community to determine the types of training that the community college could provide for students. Lott further recommended that the incoming presidents keep focused on the students they serve.

Steiner, a retiring president with 36 years of experience as a community college president at the Genesee Community College (GCC) in New York, recommended that new community college presidents emphasize the strengths of the institutions and be open to institute changes when necessary. According to Steiner, new presidents should take advantage of the goodwill that had been established by their predecessor.

Schwichtenberg, a retiring president after 21 years as president of Saint Paul College in Minnesota, reminded the new presidents that making transitions to a new presidency could sometimes be filled with pitfalls and varying degrees of friction. Accordingly, he recommended that new presidents, retain a high energy level, and establish good relationships with the college faculty and community members.

One of the most profound suggestions made to the new presidents was to focus on their students, especially when making tough decisions in challenging economic times that force budget constraints. Schwichtenberg stated that working in times of adversity can help to make a person better. According to Hytrek, the outgoing president of Moraine Park Technical College in

Wisconsin, new presidents should concentrate on mentoring and networking with their colleagues for support, as well as practice open dialogue for sharing ideas. Hytrek spoke about the need for presidents to understand the unique culture of their particular institution.

After a 20 year presidency at Guilford Technical Community College (North Carolina), Cameron urged incoming community college presidents to be patient with moving their vision and mission forward. The first six month or year may be laden with wishful thinking. Cameron stated that during his tenure, the stress was on access, but in the 21st century the model has changed and college-presidents need to focus on student success and data driven decision-making. Cameron organized his advice to new presidents through a system he called the five P's for success:

- Know your purpose. "Don't become a college president for the paycheck or build your resume."
- Approach your work with passion. "Really have passion for the community and the students."
- Perseverance. "When you get knocked down, get up, try again."
- Be patient. "Embrace this message from the Kenny Rogers song: You got to know when to hold'em, know when to fold'em. Know when to walk away, and know when to run."
- Have a positive attitude. "Your attitude is going to determine your altitude as a college president." (p. 3)

The final recommendation coming from these retiring community college presidents was on the importance of a new community college president having a vision. Giddings, retiring community college president with 18 years as president of Northwest Iowa Community College and Grand Island Campus of Central Community College in Nebraska, advised new presidents to allot time to evaluate and develop a leadership vision for their institutions. He recommended that new presidents should provide time for personal renewal because of the consuming nature of the new leadership role they will be assuming.

Survey of Presidential Leadership Styles in Higher Education

Neumann and Bensimon (1990) surveyed 32 college presidents whose institutions participated in the Institutional Leadership Project (ILP) of the National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance (NCPGF). The purpose of the ILP was determine how individuals in formal leadership positions set goals, construct agendas, communicate and interact, transmit values, and evaluate their effectiveness. Neumann and Bensimon reported findings based on a cross-section analysis collected during the project's first phase. The sample was selected purposely to reflect the diverse character of American higher education. Thirty-two institutions of higher education, including 8 universities that were stratified by type of control (e.g., public or private) and Carnegie category (e.g., research/doctoral granting), 8 state colleges and 8 community colleges that varied by structure (system/nonsystem) and governance (bargaining/nonbargaining) and 8 independent colleges divided by type of program (liberal arts/comprehensive) and sponsorship (religious/nonreligious), participated in the study. The institutions used in the study varied in geographic location (national representation), size, and setting (rural, urban, or suburban). Presidential diversity was assured by including four recently installed presidents and four seasoned presidents within each institutional category. Women and minority presidents were over sampled to insure representation (Neumann & Bensimon, 1990).

Neumann and Bensimon (1990) interviewed presidents, vice presidents, trustees, faculty, leaders, and student leaders using a common, open-ended question protocol to ensure consistency among different types of participants. They isolated the presidents' perceptions of their role, relying heavily on presidential interviews and triangulating with the responses from the other participants. Clustering descriptions allowed researchers to define four clusters: (a) differentiation of details, (b) integration of related parts, (c) abstraction or qualitative aspects of different situations, and (d) generalizations or experiences with common meanings, with

common identifiable patterns related to college presidents' interpretation of their leadership roles. These clusters were formulated using Weber's exposition of ideal types. Weber (as cited in Neumann & Bensimon, 1990) used the ideal type to interpret and gain perspective on types based on observed history and society.

Neumann and Bensimon (1990) acknowledged that none of the types presented were able to capture the reality of any one president and none of the respondents in the study reflected an ideal type as defined by Weber's exposition. The ILP provided descriptions of what a certain college presidency is and presented a starting point for continued discussion on the subject of leadership within higher education.

Neumann and Bensimon (1990) identified four presidential clusters (A, B, C, D), with specific attributes of each type. However, none of the presidents could be categorized as exhibiting one specific type. Instead, they had some attributes of all types, but most had one dominant type that defined their leadership styles. Table 2 presents a definition of the presidential type and attributes associated with each type.

Table 2

Presidential Types and Implicit Rules of Presidential Action

Type	Definition	Implicit Rules of Presidential Action
A	Presidents who describe themselves in the image of Type A govern in relative stable institutions. Although some lead financially troubled institutions, few believe they are on the brink of disaster, asserting that their already formulated “game plan,” “critical path,” or “strategy” will make a difference in rectifying past institutional misfortunes. Their faculties seem relatively satisfied with few problems in morale. (p. 686)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learn the environment and assert the institution’s role in helping to set and carry out the broader societal (or service region’s) agenda. • Initiate ideas. Set presidential goals. • Be a leader – both in the institution and outside. • Win important and influential friends for the institution. • Build a solid infrastructure, delegate operations, and do only what no one else can. Use your administrative team to keep you aware of and involved in internal institutional matters. • Preserve your power over the budget.
B	Like the Type A president, the Type B president leads a stable institution. Generally, presidents with Type B characteristics face few serious financial pressures. Their faculties appear satisfied, and most praise their president highly. (p. 687)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage unobtrusively. • Provide definition. Explain yourself and explain events. Avoid an air of secrecy and administrative seclusion. Where possible, make ambiguous events clear. • Take the pulse of the institution often. Learn what is on people’s minds and let them know what is on the presidents. • Don’t make shock waves. • Consult and explain before acting. • Think while you listen and observe. • Use your administrative team to help monitor and manage the more impersonal facts of organizational life, including those aspects of the external environment that do not require your personal attention. • Celebrate institutional and individual accomplishments. • Create a secure and comfortable environment.
C	Presidents reflecting Type C are likely to lead in the face of financial crisis, immediate or anticipated. They believe that the institution’s survival is at stake, and unlike some of their financially troubled counterparts in Cluster A, they do not see clear-cut solutions. Instead the presidents in Cluster C assume that the institution will overcome its financial difficulties only if larger, more powerful environmental problems subside first. Experienced Cluster C presidents appear to work with distressed faculties, while newer Cluster C presidents work with faculty who are more hopeful. (pp. 689-690).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Search for and be open to opportunity. • Identify and court potential resource providers. • Learn what resource providers want and sell the institution in those terms. • Publicize the college and work on its external image. • Maintain a flexible institution that can absorb and integrate new and different resources. • Maintain a flexible institution that can absorb and integrate new and different resources.

Type	Definition	Implicit Rules of Presidential Action
D	Presidents in the image of Type D currently face or have passed through financial crisis, and the fear of a possible recurrence hangs in the air. Moreover, the morale of their faculty is generally described as poor.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and eliminate organizational excess or dysfunction. • Maintain an efficient operation. • Be rational. Make logical choices based on empirical evidence. Avoid and eliminate whatever gets in the way of rational understanding and choice. • Monitor the internal organization for deviations and take immediate corrective action. • Focus on the resources needed. • Save and build up those parts of the institution that draw the most resources. • Stay in control.

Neumann & Bensimon, 1990, pp. 697-698

These four presidential types and their implicit rules of presidential action can be used as a rubric for analyzing presidential thinking in relationship to leadership at any given moment. These rules indicate how these leaders may change in their thinking over time and how campuses might change because of their leadership styles (Neumann & Bensimon, 1990).

The ideal presidential types identified by Neumann and Bensimon (1990) can be viewed as a tool for providing a common analytical yardstick to understand the community college president. The study suggested that no ideal presidential type should be considered when examining the reality of leadership (Gerth & Mills as cited in Neumann & Bensimon, 1990). The researchers concluded that identifying “ideal types” does not imply that one presidential type is better or worse than any other ideal type. These descriptions of what certain community college presidency types are like are not the definitive word on the topic, but it is a starting point for learning more about the leadership style of these presidents.

Neumann and Bensimon (1990) presented a comprehensive and broad study on how college presidential types lead. Their research contribution identified the leadership styles of college presidents in general and how these presidential types lead and function in their perspective roles. However, their research study did not specifically focus on the community

college president in their unique organizational context. Many college presidents ascribe to similar techniques and leadership styles and patterns while leading their individual institutions. However, their study, along with other similar studies, provided support for the need for a research study that focuses specifically on the leadership style of community college presidents in their unique organizational context.

Summary

This research project focuses on the leadership styles of community college presidents in the context of the institutions that they lead and the many unique challenges confronting community colleges presidents in the twenty-first century. From the review of the literature, no universal agreement has been reached on the ideal leadership style or type and traits needed to be an effective leader or community college president. Although many research studies have examined leadership and leadership theories, much of the research has resulted in many definitions on the topic (Stodgill 1974).

Historical research on the subject of leadership indicated many definitions for the term leadership, with researchers forming a consensus that leadership is a process and an art that integrates multiple disciplines (Northouse, 2004). Leadership emerges as a process that includes influence and goal attainment. Throughout history, major theories have emerged such as trait, behavior, contingency and most recently transformational leadership, with these models considered classical models of leadership theory.

The literature review raises questions about the extent to which community college presidents visualize their roles in different ways. Much of the research on community college presidents is dated, offering an impetus to determine how the role of the community college president has evolved in providing leadership to a growing segment of the post-secondary

educational system. This study examines the leadership styles of community college presidents and their attributes in a dynamic environment.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter describes the methods and procedures that were used to collect and analyze the data for this study. Topics included in this section are, research design, participants, instrumentation, data collection, and data collection procedures and data analysis.

Restatement of the Problem

Research literature on community colleges is replete with predictions of an emerging leadership shortage and a concurrent shift in approaches to leadership within community colleges. (Amey&VanDerLiden, 2002; Evelyn. 2001; Weisman & Vaughn,2002).

The purpose of this study is to examine leadership styles of Midwest community college presidents and examine what characteristics and experiences are critical for community college presidents.

Research Design

This study uses a nonexperimental, descriptive research design. The independent variable is not manipulated and no treatment or intervention is provided for the participants. Two surveys, Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire – self-leader version (MLQ; Bass & Avolio, 1997), and a researcher-developed demographic survey are used in this study. According to Gay (1996), descriptive research is defined as a way to answer questions about the study participants in a contemporary time frame.

Participants

The participants in the study are presidents of community colleges in Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Wisconsin. These presidents have been in their positions for at least one year. They may hold the title of president or chancellor. A total of 176 presidents and chancellors are in these positions.

As the population is finite and all members can be identified, a census is used. The use of a census eliminates sampling error and sampling bias. A disadvantage of the use of a census is that the results cannot be generalized to a larger population. This disadvantage is not considered problematic as the population is unique to the Midwestern area of the United States and the findings, while interesting to other states, may not be relevant to their community college presidents.

Instrumentation

Two instruments, researcher-developed demographic questionnaire and copies of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire – Self-leader Version (MLQ; Bass & Avolio, 1997) are used in this study. The reliability and validity of the instruments will be discussed in detail.

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire – Self-leader

The MLQ was developed by Bass and Avolio (1993) to measure transformational and transactional leadership styles. Multifactor leadership theory (MLT), developed by Bass (1985), has been revised by Bass and Avolio (1993) and is based on the transformational and transitional leadership dimensions. Extending the work of Burns (1978), Bass (1985) posited that leadership is based on three second-order domains: transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership. The MLQ includes 45 statements that identify and measure key aspects of leadership behavior. Each statement identifies leadership behaviors practiced by respondents; transformational, transactional, or another leadership approach. For the purpose of the present

study, the nine items (items 37 to 45) were removed from the study. These items measure outcomes of leadership and not a specific leadership style. As the study is focused on leadership styles, this subscale was excluded from the study. Each respondent is asked to judge how frequently they use the behaviors described in each statement. The MLQ is available in two versions, (a) leader version (self) and (b) rater version. For the purpose of this research, the leader version (self) questionnaire is used. Both versions use the same statements with the exception that the questions are written from the perspective of the leader respondent or the rater-respondent.

Subscales of the MLQ. The MLQ includes five subscales that measure transformational leadership, two subscales that measure transactional leadership, and two subscales that measures passive-avoidant leadership. In addition, three subscales measuring outcomes of leadership are also included on the MLQ. For the purpose of the present study, the scale, outcomes of leadership are not included on the survey. Table 3 presents the scales and subscales measured on the MLQ, along with the survey items included on each subscale.

Table 3
Scales and Subscales Measured on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

Scale	Subscale	Items on Subscale
Transformational	Idealized Attributes	10, 18, 21, 25
	Idealized Behaviors	5, 14, 23, 34
	Inspirational Motivation	9, 13, 26, 36
	Intellectual Stimulation	2, 8, 30, 32
	Individual Consideration	15, 19, 29, 31
Transactional	Contingent Reward	1, 11, 16, 35
	Management by Exception – Active	4, 22, 24, 27
Passive Avoidant	Management by Exception- Passive	3, 12, 17, 20
	Laissez-Faire	5, 7, 28, 33
Outcomes of Leadership*	Extra Effort	39, 42, 44
	Effectiveness	37, 40, 43, 45
	Satisfaction	38, 41

*Subscale deleted for the purpose of the present study

Scoring. Respondents rate each item using a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 0 for not at all, to 4 for all the time, to indicate the extent to which they practice each behavior. The numeric responses for the items on each subscale are summed to obtain a total score. The total scores are then divided by the number of items on the subscale to calculate a mean score. The use of a mean score provides scores that reflect the original 5-point scale. In addition, the use of a mean score allows direct comparisons across the subscales that would be difficult if total scores were used.

Validity and Reliability – MLQ – Leader Version (Self Rater)

The reliability and validity of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and strength in measuring leadership style have been established in the many studies that have used the instrument. According to Whitelaw (2001), reliability and validity needs to be seen in a broader context. Whitelaw indicated that reliability and validity are statistical research terms that focus on tactical and operational issues. Moreover, he suggested that the higher level strategic issues of good research are of greater importance.

Whitelaw (2001) posited that a key strength of the MLQ is its scientific origins. Over time, the MLQ has been developed through a rigorous research process that spans 15 years. According to academic research by eminent researchers (Sekaran, 1992), eight hallmarks identify good scientific research:

1. Purposiveness – research has been done to serve a worthwhile and meaningful purpose.
2. Rigor – implies painstaking and thorough research.
3. Testability – measuring some form of performance
4. Replicability - research produces similar results in similar settings
5. Precision and confidence – closeness of sample to “wider reality”

6. Objectivity – is critical to good research
7. Generalizability – applicability to the findings in a variety of settings
8. Parsimony- research must be comprehensive enough to cover key issues, yet small enough to understand

These eight factors are present in the MLQ according to Whitelaw (2001), who suggested that the instrument is sufficient to cover the full range of richness of leadership issues. This high level of strategic perspective is appropriate for development of key operational and tactical requirements for the presence of reliability and validity.

The major question regarding the MLQ revolves around reliability and validity and to assess whether it really measures leadership. Research on these topics suggested that “validity tests how well a survey instrument measures the *“particular concept”* it is supposed to measure and reliability tests show how an instrument measures that concept “consistently” (Sekaran, 1992, p. 171). According to Whitelaw (2001), the MLQ measures validity and reliability consistently in a wide variety of situations. Numerous comparative studies and countless replication studies have confirmed that the MLQ can be considered a consistent reliable and valid instrument.

The MLQ was tested for reliability and content and concurrent validity by Prujn and Boucher (1994). The instrument demonstrated internal consistency and test result indicated consistency and test result indicated that the components of transformational, transactional and not-transactional leadership are reliably measured by the MLQ (Bass & Avolio, 1993). The Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients calculated by Avolio and Bass (2004) ranged from .63 to .92 initially and from .64 to .92 when replicated. These coefficients supported the reliability of the MLQ. Bycio, Hackett and Allen (1995), conducted a factor analysis on leadership variables

(transformational and transactional leadership) and finding provided more evidence and support for the validity and reliability of the MLQ (Avolio, Bass, & Jung (1999).

Demographic Survey.

The researcher developed a short demographic survey to obtain information on the personal and professional characteristics of the community college presidents. The items on this instrument use a combination of forced-choice and fill-in the blanks. The community college presidents are assured that all information obtained on these instruments is confidential and that no individual is identifiable in the final report.

Data Collection

The researcher developed survey packets for dissemination to the community college presidents and chancellors. The survey packets include: (a) an introductory letter to the presidents and chancellors, (b) a research information sheet with a request for respondents' participation in the study, (c) the survey questionnaire, (d) demographic information sheet (DIS), and (e) a preaddressed and postage-paid return envelope for confidential return of completed surveys and demographic information sheets. An introductory letter was sent to the 176 community college presidents and chancellors in the Midwest states of Michigan (43), Illinois (56), Indiana (19), Ohio (38), and Wisconsin (20) via the United States Postal Service. The purpose of the introductory letter was to provide information regarding the study and explain the importance of their participation. The research information sheet explains the purpose of the study in addition to requesting the presidents' participation. Survey packets were distributed through the USPS. The presidents were asked to complete and return the surveys and demographic information sheet within seven working days.

The names and addresses of all community college presidents and chancellors were obtained from their respective state departments of education. An examination of these lists was

monitored for changes to insure accuracy of the lists at the time the survey was sent to the participants. A log was developed to include name addresses information; also a numeric code for follow-up on non-respondents was developed. As completed surveys were received, the researcher deleted the community college presidents from the log.

Two weeks following the initial distribution of survey packets, the researcher sent a follow-up letter to the participants. They were reminded of the purpose and importance of the study and asked to complete the surveys as soon as possible. An email address and telephone number was provided in the follow-up letter for respondents in the event that they needed to replace any survey packets if they no longer had the original packet.

According to Oppenheim (1992), a mailed survey method has advantages in that they are economical and lack interview bias. However, some disadvantages in this method of data gathering include low return rate, misinterpretation of survey items, and incomplete responses to questionnaires. Research on mailed surveys predicts an expected return rate of 30%. Fowler (1989) purported that questionnaire methods are more likely to require follow-up letters to increase survey response rates. Data collection was considered complete four weeks following initial distribution of the survey packets.

Data Analysis

The data collected from the surveys was entered into a computer file for analysis using IBM-SPSS, ver. 20.0. The data analysis was divided into three sections. The first section used frequency distributions and measures of central tendency and dispersion to summarize the demographic characteristics and provide a profile of the sample. The second section used descriptive statistics to provide base line information on the scaled variables measured on the MLQ. The third section of the survey used inferential statistical analyses to address the research questions. All decisions on the statistical significance of the findings were based on a criterion

alpha level of .05. The statistical analyses used to test each research question are presented in Table 4.

Table 4
Statistical Analysis

Research Question	Variables	Statistical Analysis
1. Do leadership styles of Midwest community college presidents differ relative to the number of students enrolled in their community colleges?	<p><u>Dependent Variables</u></p> <p>Multifactor Leadership Style</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transformational • Transactional • Passive Avoidant <p><u>Independent Variables</u></p> <p>Size of the community college (number of students)</p>	<p>A one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to determine if the scores on the Multifactor Leadership Style questionnaire differ relative to the number of students.</p> <p>The presidents provided the number of students at their colleges. A three-way split (33%ile and 67%ile) was used to form three groups (small, medium, and large). These categories were used as the independent variable.</p> <p>If a statistically significant omnibus F was obtained on the MANOVA, the univariate F tests were interpreted to determine which of the four subscales were contributing to the statistically significant difference.</p> <p>If statistically significant differences were found on the individual subscales, all possible pairwise comparisons were made using Scheffé a posteriori tests.</p>
2. Can Midwest community college presidents' leadership styles be predicted from college demographics, (e.g., number of administrative personnel, number of full-time and part-time faculty, number of students, and geographic location)?	<p><u>Dependent Variables</u></p> <p>Multifactor Leadership Style</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transformational • Transactional • Passive Avoidant <p><u>Independent Variables</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of administrative personnel • Number of full-time and part-time faculty • Number of students • Geographic location 	<p>Separate stepwise multiple linear regression analyses were used to determine which of the community college demographic variables can be used to predict and explain the dependent variables.</p>

Research Question	Variables	Statistical Analysis
3. Can Midwest community college presidents' leadership styles be predicted from the president's personal and professional characteristics, e.g., gender, race, age, educational level, and longevity in the community college system?	<u>Dependent Variables</u> Multifactor Leadership Style <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transformational • Transactional • Passive Avoidant <u>Independent Variables</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender • Race • Age • Educational Level • Length of time in community college system 	Separate stepwise multiple linear regression analyses were used to determine which of the personal demographic variables can be used to predict and explain the dependent variables

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

The results of the data analyses that were used to describe the sample and address the research questions are presented in this chapter. The chapter is divided in to three sections. The first section provides a profile of the college presidents, using frequency distributions and measures of central tendency and dispersion. Descriptive statistics are used in the second section of the survey to provide baseline data on the scaled variables. The results of the inferential statistical analysis that were used to address the research questions are presented in the third section of the chapter.

The projected shortage and exodus of experienced community college president drives the need to explore the leadership styles of current community college presidents. As warnings of this emerging shortage persist, relatively little attention has been given to considering what community college presidential leadership styles are important in the organizational context of the community college. The purpose of this study was to examine the leadership styles of Midwest community college presidents and chancellors in Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin.

A total of 176 survey packets were distributed to community college presidents in the five states. Of this number, 82 survey packets were completed and returned for a response rate of 46.6%.

Description of the Sample

The participants were asked to provide their personal characteristics, age, gender, race, and educational level, on the survey. Their responses were summarized using frequency distributions for presentation in Table 5.

Table 5

Frequency Distributions – Personal Characteristics (N = 82)

Personal Characteristics	Frequency	Percent
Age		
30 and under	1	1.3
31 to 40	2	2.6
41 to 50	13	16.9
51 to 60	23	29.9
61 and over	38	49.3
Missing 5		
Gender		
Male	56	71.8
Female	22	28.2
Missing 4		
Race/Ethnicity		
African American	6	7.7
American Indian/Alaskan Native	2	2.6
Caucasian	67	85.9
Hispanic	3	3.8
Missing 4		
Educational Level		
Master Degree	7	9.0
Education Specialist	1	1.3
Doctorate	70	89.7
Missing 4		

Nearly half of college presidents ($n = 38$, 49.3%) reported their ages as 61 and over, with 23 (29.9%) indicating their ages were between 51 and 60. One (1.3%) president was 30 years and under, with 2 (2.6%) reporting their ages were between 31 and 40 years. Five participants did not provide a response to this question.

Almost three-fourths of participants ($n = 56$, 71.8%) reported their gender as male, with the remaining 22 (28.2%) presidents indicating their gender as female. Four participants did not provide a response to this question.

An overwhelming 85.97% of participants ($n = 67$) indicated Caucasian as their race/ethnicity. Six (7.7%) African Americans participated in the study. Three (3.8%) Hispanic college

presidents and 2 (2.6%) American Indian/Alaskan Native presidents participated in the study. Four college presidents did not provide a response to this question.

An equally overwhelming majority of the presidents ($n = 70$, 89.7%) indicated that they had obtained doctorate degrees. Seven (9.0%) community college presidents had master's degrees and 1 (1.3%) had an education specialist degree. Four college presidents did not provide a response to this question.

The community college presidents were asked to indicate the location of their community colleges. Their responses were summarized using frequency distributions for presentation in Table 6.

Table 6

Frequency Distributions – Location of the Community College ($N = 82$)

Location of the Community College	Frequency	Percent
Urban	26	33.8
Suburban	22	28.6
Rural	29	37.7
Total	77	100.0
Missing	5	

Perhaps surprisingly the largest group of community colleges ($n = 29$, 37.7%) were located in rural areas, with 26 (33.8%) community colleges located in urban areas. Only twenty-two (28.6%) participants reported that their community colleges were located in suburban areas. Five community college presidents did not provide a response regarding the location of their community college.

The participants were asked to provide their experiences in higher education. The responses to these questions were summarized using descriptive statistics. Table 7 presents results of these analyses.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics – Personal Experiences in Higher Education

Personal Experiences	Number	Mean	SD	Median	Range	
					Minimum	Maximum
Years in higher education	78	26.74	11.44	28	1	49
Years employed in a community college	78	20.58	11.20	21	1	46
Years as a community college president	78	8.32	7.06	6	1	30
Number of community college presidencies	77	1.39	.69	1	1	4

The community college presidents had spent a very long career in higher education for a mean of 26.74 (sd = 11.44) years, with a median of 28 years. The range of time in higher education was from 1 to 49 years. Four community college presidents did not provide a response to this question. Community college presidents are recruited from the ranks of community colleges.

The mean number of years that the community college presidents had been in community colleges was 20.58 (sd = 11.20), with a median of 21 years. The range of years employed in a community college was from 1 to 46 years. Four community college presidents did not provide a response to this question.

The number of years as a community college president ranged from 1 to 30 years, with a median of 6 years. The mean number of years as a community college president was quite high 8.32 (sd = 7.06) years. Four community college presidents did not provide a response to this question.

The community college presidents had a mean of 1.39 (sd = .69) community college presidencies. The median number of community college presidencies was 1, with a range from 1 to 4. Five community college presidents did not provide a response to this question.

The participants were asked to report their previous positions prior to their present community college presidency. Table 8 presents results of this analysis.

Table 8

Frequency Distributions – Previous Position Prior to Present Community College Presidency (N = 82)

Previous Positions	Frequency	Percent
Vice President	26	31.8
President	19	23.3
Dean	12	14.7
Chief Academic Officer	5	6.1
Provost	3	3.7
Professor	2	2.4
Executive Director	2	2.4
Superintendent K-12	2	2.4
State Director	2	2.4
Chief Operation and Financial Officer	2	2.4
Assistant Provost	1	1.2
Attorney	1	1.2
Principal Consulting Firm	1	1.2
Assistant Chancellor	1	1.2
High School Principal	1	1.2
Chief Campus Administrator	1	1.2
Assistant Regional Superintendent	1	1.2
Total	82	100.0

Over half of the respondents had ascended to their current community college position from a community college presidency or vice presidency. The largest group of participants (n =

26, 31.8%) reported their previous position was as a community college vice president, with 19 (23.3%) indicating previous position was a community college president. Twelve (14.75) community college presidents were deans in their previous positions and 5 (6.1%) participants had previous positions as chief academic officers. Three (3.7%) participants had been provosts in their previous positions. Two (2.4%) participants each reported their previous positions as: executive director, superintendent K-12 schools, state director, and chief operation and financial officers. One (1.2%) community college presidents each indicated their previous positions as assistant provost, attorney, principal consulting firm, assistant chancellor, high school principal, chief campus administrator, and assistant regional superintendent.

The participants were asked to indicate if their previous position before their current positions was in the same or different community college. Their responses were summarized using frequency distributions. Table 9 presents results of this analysis.

Table 9

Frequency Distributions – Location of Previous Position (N = 82)

Location of Previous Positions	Frequency	Percent
Same community college	26	35.1
Different community college	41	55.4
Position outside of a community college	7	9.5
Total	74	100.0
Missing	8	

A slight majority of community college presidents (n = 41, 55.4%) indicated that their previous positions was at a different community college, with 26 (35.1%) reporting their previous position was at the same community college. Seven (9.5%) had previous positions outside of the community college environment. Eight participants did not provide a response to this question.

The participants were asked to provide information regarding their community college's demographics. Their responses were summarized using descriptive statistics. Table 10 presents results of this analysis.

Table 10

Descriptive Statistics – Demographics of the Community College

Community College Demographics	N	Mean	SD	Median	Range	
					Minimum	Maximum
Number of Students	78	12,231.56	12,449.27	7,000.00	325	70,000
Number of Full-time Faculty	77	136.97	118.28	97.00	15	620
Number of Adjunct Faculty	76	352.64	328.99	220.00	17	1500
Number of Administrators	76	43.32	38.83	32.50	3	220

The mean number of students was quite high at 12,231.56 (sd = 12,449.27), with a median of 7,000 students. The range of students enrolled at the community colleges ranged from 325 to 70,000. Four community college presidents did not provide a response to this question.

The community college presidents reported a mean of 136.97 (sd = 118.28) full-time faculty at their institutions. The median number of full-time faculty was 97, with a range from 15 to 620. Five participants did not provide a response to this question.

The range of adjunct faculty at the community colleges was from 17 to 1,500, with a median of 220 adjunct faculty members or more than double the number of full-time faculty. The mean number of adjunct faculty members was 352.64 (sd = 328.99). Six community college presidents did not provide a response to this question.

The community college presidents reported that their institutions had a mean of 43.32 (sd = 38.83) administrators, with a median of 32.50 administrators. The number of administrators at

the community colleges ranged from 3 to 220. Six community college presidents did not provide a response to this question.

Description of the Scaled Variables

The three subscales that were measured on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) were scored using the protocol developed by the scale authors. Possible scores on these subscales could range from 0 to 4, with higher scores on this subscale indicating that the community college presidents used the particular leadership style. The responses were summarized using descriptive statistics for presentation in Table 11.

Table 11

Descriptive Statistics – Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Subscales

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Subscales	N	Mean	SD	Median	Range	
					Minimum	Maximum
Transformational	82	3.16	.31	3.15	2.35	3.80
Transactional	82	2.22	.41	2.23	1.25	3.38
Passive Avoidant	82	.66	.44	.63	0.00	2.38

The mean score for transformational leadership was 3.16 (sd = .31), with a median score of 3.16. The range of actual scores was from 2.35 to 3.80, with possible scores ranging from 0 to 4. The community college presidents had a mean score of 2.22 (sd = .41) for transactional leadership. The median score on this subscale was 2.23, with actual scores ranging from 1.25 to

3.38. The mean scores for passive avoidant leadership ($m = .66$, $sd = .44$), with a median of .63. Actual scores on this subscale ranged from 0 to 2.38.

Research Questions

Three research questions were developed for this study. Each of these questions was addressed using inferential statistical analyses. All decisions on the statistical significance of the findings were made using a criterion alpha level of .05.

Research question 1: Do leadership styles of Midwest community college presidents differ relative to the number of students enrolled in their community colleges?

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to compare the three leadership styles by the size of the student body. The community college presidents' self-report of the number of students was divided into three groups (0 to 33%, 34 to 66%, and 67 to 100%). The scores on the three leadership styles were used as the dependent variables in this analysis. Table 12 presents results of this analysis.

Table 12

Multivariate Analysis of Variance – Leadership Styles by Size of Student Body

Hotelling's Trace	F Ratio	DF	Sig	Effect Size
.07	.87	6, 144	.516	.04

The comparison of the three leadership styles by the size of the student body was not statistically significant, $F(6, 144) = .87$, $p = .516$, $d = .04$. This finding indicated that the leadership styles used by the community college presidents did not differ by the size of the student body. To further investigate the lack of statistically significant differences, descriptive

statistics were obtained for each of the subscales by the size of the student body. Table 13 presents results of this analysis.

Table 13

Descriptive Statistics – Leadership Styles by Size of Student Body

Leadership Style	Number	Mean	SD
Transformational			
Small (through 4,700 students)	27	3.09	.33
Medium (4,700 through 13,130)	26	3.23	.23
Large (13,130 through 70,000)	25	3.15	.36
Transactional			
Small (through 4,700 students)	27	2.09	.35
Medium (4,700 through 13,130)	26	2.29	.45
Large (13,130 through 70,000)	25	2.24	.43
Passive Avoidant			
Small (through 4,700 students)	27	.68	.51
Medium (4,700 through 13,130)	26	.62	.50
Large (13,130 through 70,000)	25	.64	.32

An examination of the mean scores provided further evidence that community college presidents' leadership style did not differ relative to the size of their student body. The community college presidents, regardless of the number of students enrolled at their community colleges, appeared to favor a transformational leadership style, with passive avoidant leadership styles being the least preferred.

Research question 2. Can Midwest community college presidents' leadership styles be predicted from college demographics (e.g., number of administrative personnel, number of full-time and part-time faculty, number of students, and geographic location)?

Separate stepwise multiple linear regression analyses were used to determine which of the college demographics (number of administrative personnel, number of full-time and part-time faculty, number of students, and geographic location) could be used to predict scores for transformational, transactional, and passive avoidant leadership styles. None of the college demographics entered the stepwise multiple linear regression equation for each of the three

leadership styles, indicating they were not statistically significant predictors of a preference for transformational, transactional, or passive avoidant leadership styles.

Research question 3. Can Midwest community college presidents' leadership styles be predicted from the president's personal and professional characteristics (e.g., gender, race, age, educational level, and longevity in the community college system)?

Separate stepwise multiple linear regression analyses were used to determine if the three leadership styles (transformational, transactional, and passive avoidant) could be predicted from personal and professional characteristics of community college presidents. The personal and professional characteristics included: age, gender, educational level, years in higher education, years at a community college, years as a president of a community college, and number of community college presidencies. The first stepwise multiple linear regression analysis used transformational leadership as the criterion variable. Table 14 provides results of this analysis.

Table 14

Stepwise Multiple Linear Regression Analysis: Transformational Leadership Styles

Predictor	Constant	b-Weight	β -Weight	Δr^2	t-Value	Sig
Included Variables						
Years in higher education	3.34	-.01	-.24	.06	-2.15	.035
Excluded Variables						
Age			-.03		-.21	.835
Gender			.11		.93	.354
Highest level of education			-.01		-.03	.978
Years employed in a community college			-.01		-.10	.923
Years as a community college president			.09		.64	.523
Number of community college presidencies			-.06		-.45	.657
Multiple R	.24					
Multiple R ²	.06					
F Ratio	4.61					
DF	1, 74					
Sig	.035					

One independent variable, years in higher education, entered the stepwise multiple linear regression equation, explaining 6% of the variance in transformational leadership, $\beta = -.24$, $r^2 = .06$, $t = -2.15$, $p = .035$. The negative relationship indicated that community college presidents who had been in higher education for longer periods of time were likely to have less positive perceptions regarding transformational leadership. The remaining independent variables, age, gender, highest level of education, years employed in a community college, years as a community college president, and number of community college presidencies, did not enter the stepwise multiple linear regression equation, indicating they were not statistically significant predictors of transformational leadership style.

The scores for transactional leadership were used as the dependent variable in a stepwise multiple linear regression analysis, with the same set of personal and professional characteristics used as the independent variables. None of the independent variables (age, gender, highest level of education, years in higher education, years employed in a community college, years as a community college president, and number of community college presidencies) entered the stepwise multiple linear regression equation, indicating they were not statistically significant predictors of transactional leadership.

The scores for passive avoidant leadership styles were used as the dependent variable in a stepwise multiple linear regression analysis. The personal and professional characteristics of the community college presidents were used as the independent variables in this analysis. Table 15 presents results of this analysis.

Table 15

Stepwise Multiple Linear Regression Analysis: Passive Avoidant Leadership Styles

Predictor	Constant	b-Weight	β -Weight	Δr^2	t-Value	Sig
Included Variables						
Years employed in a community college	.55	-.01	-.29	.06	-2.60	.011
Gender		.26	.27	.07	2.41	.019
Excluded Variables						
Age			.07		.59	.555
Highest level of education			-.07		-.60	.550
Years in higher education			.07		.47	.637
Years as a community college president			.05		.34	.733
Number of community college presidencies			-.01		-.10	.918
Multiple R	.36					
Multiple R ²	.13					
F Ratio	4.44					
DF	2, 73					
Sig	.007					

Two independent variables, years employed in a community college and gender, entered the stepwise multiple linear regression equation, accounting for 13% of the variance in passive avoidant leadership styles, $R^2 = .13$, $F(2, 73) = 4.44$, $p = .007$. Years employed in a community college entered the stepwise multiple linear regression equation first, explaining 6% of the variance in passive avoidant leadership styles, $\beta = -.29$, $r^2 = .06$, $t = -2.60$, $p = .011$. The negative relationship between the two variables indicated that community college presidents who had been in their positions for longer periods had less positive perceptions of passive avoidant leadership styles. Gender entered the stepwise multiple linear regression equation, accounting for an additional 7% of the variance in passive avoidant leadership styles. The positive relationship indicated that female community college presidents (coded as a 2) were more likely to have higher scores for passive avoidant than male community college presidents (coded as a 1). The

remaining personal and professional characteristics (age, highest level of education, years in higher education, years as a community college president, and number of community college presidencies), were not statistically significant predictors of passive avoidant leadership styles.

Summary

Chapter Four has presented the results of the statistical analyses that were used to describe the sample and address the three research questions posed for the study. Conclusions and recommendations based on these findings can be found in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Scholars and educational stakeholders continue to express concern regarding predictions of an emerging leadership shortage and a shift in the approaches to leadership within community colleges. These warnings drove the necessity for research on the leadership styles of the soon to be retired presidents. These retiring community college presidents will take a vast knowledge base with them regarding effective leadership styles for these types of institutions. This knowledge resource could be used by future community college presidents. Literature on the subject of leadership styles of community college presidents suggested that new community college presidents may be facing many daunting challenges in the 21st century (Amey & VanDerlinden, 2002; Evelyn, 2001; Weisman & Vaughn, 2002).

The term, leadership, has many definitions, with many researchers forming a consensus that leadership is both a process and an art integrating many disciplines, specifically focusing on influence and goal attainment (Northouse, 2004). In the context of the community college president, a review of the literature suggested that community college presidents visualize their roles in leading their institutions in different ways. The lack of current information provided the momentum to study the community college presidents' leadership styles. The purpose of this study is driven by the projected shortage and retirement of experienced community college presidents and explores their leadership styles and provides a possible informational resource for those who are expected to fill the leadership voids within the community college educational system.

Methods

A nonexperimental, descriptive research design was used for the present study. A total of 176 Midwestern community college presidents and chancellors in Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Wisconsin were asked to participate in the study. The presidents had been in their positions for at least one year and their job titles were president or chancellor. The investigator used two instruments, a researcher-developed demographic questionnaire and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire – Self-leader Version (MLQ: Bass & Avolio, 1997). For the purpose of the study the researcher removed nine items (items 37 to 45) from the MLQ. These items measured outcomes of leadership and not a specific leadership style. The MLQ included five subscales that measured transformational leadership, two subscales that measured transactional leadership, and two subscales that measured passive-avoidant leadership.

The data collected from the surveys was entered into a computer file for analysis using IBM-SPSS ver. 20.0. A total of 176 survey packets were distributed to community college president in the five states. Of this number, 82 survey packets were completed and returned for a rate of 46.6 %.

Findings

The largest group of college presidents reported their ages as 61 and over, with the second largest group indicating their ages were between 51 and 60, with 2 (2.6) indicating their ages between 31 and 40 years. The ages of these community college presidents provide evidence of the impending retirement that can be expected to leave their institutions without experienced leadership. The overwhelming majority of the presidents reported their gender as male and Caucasian. Ninety percent of community college presidents had obtained doctorate degrees, similar to the 87% reported by Amey and VanDerLinden (2002).

The largest of group of community colleges 37.77% were located in rural areas with (33.8%) located in urban areas. A large number of the community college presidents indicated that they had been in higher education from 1 to 49 years and in a community college from 1 to 46 years. The number of years as a community college president ranged from 1 to 30 years, with a mean of 8.32 (sd = 7.06) years.

The number of community college presidencies held by the participants ranged from one to four. The participants also indicated that they had held a variety of previous positions prior to their present community college presidency. The largest group of participants 31.8% reported their previous positions as a community college vice president, followed by community college presidents, 23.3% held such positions as deans, chief of academic officers, provosts, executive director, superintendent K-12 schools, state directors, and chief operation and financial officers, high school principals and chief campus administrators. These data are similar to the findings reported by Amey and VanDerLinden (2002), where 37% of community college presidents ascended from being provost and 25% had served as president of another community college.

The majority of community college presidents indicated that their previous positions were at different community colleges than where they are at present. The presidents responded to questions regarding the demographics of their current community colleges. The mean number of students at the participating community colleges was 12,231, with the range of students enrolled at the community colleges ranging from 325 to 70,000. The median number of full-time faculty was 97, with a range from 15 to 620. The range of adjunct faculty was from 17 to 1,500, with a median of 220 adjunct faculty members. The mean number of adjunct faculty members was 352.64. The number of administrators at the community colleges ranged from 3 to 220.

The responses to the MLQ were summarized by summing the numeric ratings for each leadership style and dividing by the number of items on that subscale. The mean scores could

range from 0 to 4, with higher scores indicating a preference for a particular leadership style. When the mean scores were compared, community college presidents appeared to favor a transformational leadership styles ($m = 3.16$, $sd = .31$), with passive avoidant leadership styles ($m = .66$, $sd = .44$) being the least preferred.

Research questions

Three research questions were developed for this study. Each question was addressed using inferential statistical analyses. All decisions on the statistical significance of the findings were made using a criterion alpha level of .05.

Research question 1. Do leadership styles of Midwest community college presidents differ relative to the number of student enrolled in their community colleges?

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to compare the three leadership styles by the size of the student body. The community college presidents' self-report of the number of students was divided into three groups (0 to 33%, 34 to 66%, and 67 to 100%). The scores on the three leadership styles were used as the dependent variables in this analysis. The comparison of the three leadership styles by size of the student body was not statistically significant. This finding indicated that the leadership styles used by the community college presidents did not differ by the size of the student body.

Research question 2. Can Midwest community college presidents' leadership styles be predicted from college demographics (e.g., number of administrative personnel, number of full-time and part-time faculty, number of students, and geographic location)?

Separate stepwise multiple linear regression analyses were used to determine if the community college demographics could be used to predict transformational, transactional, and passive avoidant leadership styles. None of the independent variables, (number of administrative personnel, number of full-time and part-time faculty, number of students, and geographic

location) entered the stepwise multiple linear regression equations, indicating that community college demographics were not statistically significant predictors of transformational, transactional, and passive avoidant leadership styles.

Research question 3. Can Midwest community college presidents' leadership styles be predicted from the president's personal and professional characteristics (e.g., gender, race, age, educational level, and longevity in the community college system)?

The three leadership styles, transformational, transactional, and passive avoidant, were used as dependent variables in a stepwise multiple linear regression analysis. The community college presidents' personal and professional characteristics, age, gender, highest level of education, years in higher education, years employed in a community college, years as a community college president, and number of community college presidencies, were used as the independent variables. Years in higher education was a statistically significant predictor of transformational leadership styles, with community college presidents who were in higher education for longer periods having less positive perceptions of transformational leadership styles. None of the personal and professional variables entered the stepwise multiple linear regression equation for transactional leadership style. Years employed in a community college and gender was statistically significant predictors of passive avoidant leadership styles. Community college presidents who were employed in a community college for a longer time were less likely to endorse passive avoidant leadership styles. Female community college presidents were more likely to have higher scores for passive avoidant leadership styles.

Conclusions

A near majority (49.3%) of the presidents self-reported their ages as 61 and over, similar to the 57% of community college presidents in Weisman's 2006 survey who were 58 or older. These reports provided evidence that many community college presidents are nearing retirement.

As these leaders retire, community college systems will begin to search for replacements and may want to attract presidents with a particular leadership style. This potential leadership shortage within community college systems may be more profound than projections for four-year educational institutions (Evelyn, 2001; Schultz 2001; Weisman & Vaughan 2002).

The study findings appear to parallel results of a study by Wiesman and Vaughan (2006) in the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) on trends of community college presidents. They surveyed 545 community college presidents throughout the United States and their survey results reflected findings of the current study, with most community college presidents being Caucasian, male, and older. In the Wiesman survey, 88% of the presidents were both Caucasian and male, where in this study, fewer were male (72%), but an equal proportion (88%) were Caucasian.

Most community college presidents in the study appeared to embrace transformational leadership styles, with passive avoidance as the least preferred leadership style. However, female community college presidents were more likely to prefer passive avoidant leadership styles than male community college presidents. Research on community college presidents has suggested that transformational leadership is a viable approach for presidents to embrace within the community college educational system.

Transformational leadership, at its core, is described as focusing on the ability of groups to take responsibility; it transcends the personal self-interest of the leader and puts focus on the needs of the task. Bass (1990) suggested that transformational leaders encourage their subordinates to become leaders. Bensimon, Neuman, and Birnbaum (1989) suggested that community colleges have evolved into institutions that have begun to embrace dynamic, globalized, and processed-oriented leadership perspectives that are focused on cross-cultural understanding, collaboration, and social responsibility. Leaders with transformational styles seek

to inspire and motivate subordinates, as well as encourage teamwork and provide shared vision between leader and followers seeking positive institutional outcomes.

Vaughan ((1986a) in his profile of community college presidents highlighted four major qualities for the prototypical community college president: (a) integrity, (b) judgment, (c) courage, and (d) concern. Vaughn's later research moved beyond highlighting presidential personal traits to viewing presidents as builders with vast responsibilities. Burns (1978) and Bass (1985) supported the idea that transformational leaders were concerned with advancing followers' goals and beliefs to change the goals that can impact an organization's mission and its success. The leadership model developed by Roueche, Baker, and Rose (1989) proposed that community college presidents who exhibit transformational leadership believe in teamwork and decision making, value people, have vision. The twenty-first century community colleges, according to Gratton (1993), called for community colleges to shift conceptually toward shared leadership and embrace learning among leaders and followers as an effective organizational model.

The analyses of the research on the leadership styles of the five Midwestern state community college presidents indicated that these presidents were the driving force for creating solutions to the internal and external problems confronting their community colleges. These presidents' professional experiences, leadership styles, and impending retirements are important concerns of community college boards. Researchers (Evelyn, 2001; Eddy & VanDerLiden, 2006; Jeffery, 2008) have discussed retirements of seasoned community college presidents and the importance of determining their primary leadership styles. No scholarly consensus has been reached regarding the most effective leadership styles used by community college presidents (Ehrle & Bennett, 1998).

Implications for Practice

The findings of the present study make a compelling argument to begin developing community college leaders early. Leadership programs need to be implemented for community college personnel interested in moving into leadership positions. Through awareness of the impending retirements and the need for new leaders, these programs could help to fill the potential void of qualified applicants for the presidencies as they become vacant.

Many of the applicants will have the educational credentials and community college experience as instructors or administrators. However, depending on their educational background or their prior professional experiences, they may need to participate in programs that can help them understand the different leadership styles and allow them to develop effective leadership styles.

Community college boards should be aware of the type of leadership styles are most desirable when making hiring decisions for potential community college presidents. Using role playing, checking references, and asking probing questions that could provide clues about the applicant's leadership style can help the board members to choose the best candidate for the position.

Recommendations for Further Study

The present study explored leadership styles of Midwestern community college presidents. Further research is needed to understand the characteristics, skills, and preparation needed for aspiring administrators seeking to move into the position of community college president. The following recommendations can provide additional insight into leadership styles of community college presidents:

- Examine the existence and availability of professional development programs that are focused on deans, provosts, and administrators who want to transition into vacant community college presidencies.
- Investigate community college boards to determine the preferred personal and professional characteristics of applicants who are seeking the presidency of their community colleges to determine the commonalities and differences by size and location of the community college.
- Use a descriptive research design to study perceptions of community college deans, administrators, and professional staff to determine the extent to which they are satisfied with the leadership style of their community college president.
- Use a retrospective research design to determine the success of the current community college president in meeting the goals and objectives set by the board of trustees. The data could be drawn from published reports, instructor and administrative surveys, and student outcomes (e.g., enrollment and graduation rates, etc.).

APPENDIX A**INTRODUCTION LETTER TO PRESIDENTS**

Date

Dear Community College President:

As a part of my doctoral studies in Education Leadership and Policy Studies, at Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan, I am conducting doctoral dissertation research on the leadership styles of community college presidents in the Midwestern part of the United States. This study will assess community college presidents' and chancellors' leadership styles in Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana and Wisconsin. The study will examine the relationship between leadership style and factors such as institutional size (student enrollment), type of institution (mission), location (urban, suburban, and rural).

I am requesting that you participate in this study. Your participation may be helpful to higher education stakeholders as they develop leadership-training programs for prospective community college administrators and others who aspire to the position of community college president. Approximately 10 to 15 minutes of your time will be needed to complete the 36 item Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire – self leader (MLQ-S; Bass & Avolio, 1997), and a short 15 item demographic survey instrument. No individual or community college will be identifiable in the final report.

Following completion of the study, I will be sending the results to each of the presidents who participated in the study. Your participation is essential for this study. Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sincerely

Marvin Jones Jacobs, Ed. Specialist
Doctoral Candidate

APPENDIX B**INSTRUMENTS**

Demographic Survey

Please answer the items as they apply to you. There are no right or wrong answers and all information will be confidential. No individual or community college will be identifiable in the final report.

Age

- ☐ 30 and under
☐ 31 to 40
☐ 41 to 50
☐ 51 to 60
☐ 61 and over

Gender

- ☐ Male
☐ Female

Race/Ethnicity

- ☐ African American
☐ American Indian/Alaskan Native
☐ Asian/Pacific Islander
☐ Caucasian
☐ Hispanic
☐ Middle Eastern
☐ Other _____

Highest Level of Completed Education

- ☐ Bachelor's degree
☐ Master's degree
☐ Education specialist
☐ Doctorate

Location of Community College

- ☐ Urban
☐ Suburban
☐ Rural

Years in higher education _____

_____ years

Years employed in a community college _____

_____ years

Years as a community college president _____

_____ years

Number of community college presidencies _____

Last position held at time of appointment to your present position
as community college president _____

Was your previous position at the same or different community college?

- ☐ Same community college ☐ Different community college

Number of students enrolled at your community college _____

Number of full-time faculty _____

Number of adjunct faculty _____

Number of administrators _____

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

0	1	2	3	4
Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, if not always

Place a check mark in the column that indicates how frequently each statement fits use. The word "others" may mean your peers, clients, direct reports, supervisors, and/or all of these individuals.	0	1	2	3	4
1. I provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts.					
2. I re-examine critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate.					
3. I fail to interfere until problems become serious.					
4. I focus attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions and deviations from standards.					
5. I avoid getting involved when important issues arise.					
6. I talk about my most important values and beliefs.					
7. I am absent when needed.					
8. I seek differing perspectives when solving problems.					
9. I talk optimistically about the future.					
10. I instill pride in others for being associated with me.					
11. I discuss in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets.					
12. I wait for things to go wrong before taking action.					
13. I talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished.					
14. I specify the importance of having a strong sense of purpose.					
15. I spend time teaching and coaching.					
16. I make clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved.					
17. I show that I am a firm believer in "if it ain't broke, don't fix it."					
18. I go beyond self-interest for the good of the group.					
19. I treat others as individuals rather than just as a member of a group.					
20. I demonstrate that problems must become chronic before I take action.					
21. I act in ways that build others' respect for me.					
22. I concentrate my full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures.					
23. I consider the moral and ethical consequences of decisions.					
24. I keep track of all mistakes.					

0	1	2	3	4
Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, if not always

Place a check mark in the column that indicates how frequently each statement fits use. The word "others" may mean your peers, clients, direct reports, supervisors, and/or all of these individuals.	0	1	2	3	4
25. I display a sense of power and confidence.					
26. I articulate a compelling vision of the future.					
27. I direct my attention toward failures to meet standards.					
28. I avoid making decisions.					
29. I consider an individual as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others.					
30. I get others to look at problems from many different angles.					
31. I help others to develop their strengths.					
32. I suggest new ways to looking at how to complete assignments.					
33. I delay responding to urgent questions.					
34. I emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission.					
35. I express satisfaction when others meet expectations.					
36. I express confidence that goals will be achieved.					

APPENDIX C**RESEARCH INFORMATION SHEET**

Title: An Examination of Midwest Community College Presidents Leadership Styles

Principal Investigator: Marvin Jones Jacobs

RESEARCH INFORMATION LETTER**I. Introduction and Purpose**

As part of my doctoral studies at Wayne State University, I am conducting a research study on community college presidents. The purpose of this study is to examine the leadership styles of Midwest community college presidents.

II. Procedure

Participants will be asked to complete two questionnaires: Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, and a short demographic survey. The questionnaires should not require more than 10 to 15 minutes to complete.

III. Benefits

There are no benefits to the participants.

III. Risks

No risks or additional effects are likely to result from your participation in this study. In the unlikely event of an injury arising from participation in this study, no reimbursement, compensation, or free medical treatment is offered by Wayne State University or the researcher.

V. Voluntary Participation/Withdrawal

Your participation in this study is voluntary, with the return of your completed survey evidence of your willingness to participate in the study. Once you have returned your completed survey, you can withdraw until the end of the data collection period. Following this period, your survey will not be identifiable, preventing your withdrawal.

VI. Costs

There are no costs involved in your participation in the study.

Title: An Examination of Midwest Community College Presidents' Leadership Styles

Principal Investigator: Marvin Jones Jacobs

VII. Compensation

There is no compensation being offered for participation in the study.

VIII. Confidentiality

All information collected during the course of this study will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law. All information will be presented in aggregate, with no individual participant identifiable in the study.

IX. Questions

If you have any questions regarding the items on the survey or the purpose of the study, please feel free to contact me at your earliest convenience. I can be reached at _____ or by email at _____. If you would like information regarding your rights regarding participation in this study, please contact the chairperson of the Wayne State University Behavioral Investigation Committee at (313) 577-1628.

X. Consent to Participate in a Research Trial

The return of your completed survey is evidence of your willingness to participate in this study. If you would like to receive a copy of the results, please include a business card with your survey. Please retain this information sheet in case you have any questions or would like additional information regarding this study.

APPENDIX D

HUMAN INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE APPROVAL



HUMAN INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE
 87 East Canfield, Second Floor
 Detroit, Michigan 48201
 Phone: (313) 577-1628
 FAX: (313) 993-7122
<http://hic.wayne.edu>



NOTICE OF EXPEDITED APPROVAL

To: Marvin Jacobs
 Placement Services
 1001 Faculty/Administration B1

From: Dr. Scott Millis *S. Millis, PhD*
 Chairperson, Behavioral Institutional Review Board (B3)

Date: April 28, 2011

RE: HIC #: 047411B3E
 Protocol Title: An Examination of Midwest Community College Presidents' Leadership Styles
 Funding Source:
 Protocol #: 1104009669

Expiration Date: April 27, 2012

Risk Level / Category: Research not involving greater than minimal risk

The above-referenced protocol and items listed below (if applicable) were **APPROVED** following *Expedited Review* Category (#7)* by the Chairperson/designee for the Wayne State University Institutional Review Board (B3) for the period of 04/28/2011 through 04/27/2012. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals that may be required.

- This research meets the criteria for Expedited Review category #7.
- Receipt of a research protocol
- Introduction Letter to Presidents
- Research Information Sheet (dated 04-28-11).

- * Federal regulations require that all research be reviewed at least annually. You may receive a "Continuation Renewal Reminder" approximately two months prior to the expiration date; however, it is the Principal Investigator's responsibility to obtain review and continued approval *before* the expiration date. Data collected during a period of lapsed approval is unapproved research and can *never* be reported or published as research data.
- * All changes or amendments to the above-referenced protocol require review and approval by the HIC **BEFORE** implementation.
- * Adverse Reactions/Unexpected Events (AR/UE) must be submitted on the appropriate form within the timeframe specified in the HIC Policy (<http://www.hic.wayne.edu/hicpol.html>).

NOTE:

1. Upon notification of an impending regulatory site visit, hold notification, and/or external audit the HIC office must be contacted immediately.
2. Forms should be downloaded from the HIC website at *each* use.

*Based on the Expedited Review List, revised November 1998

REFERENCES

- Agryis, C., & Schon, D. (1992). *Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Amey, J.M., & VanDerLinden (2002). *Career Paths for Community College Leaders*. American Association of Community Colleges. Retrieved May 5, 2010 from <http://www.acc.nche.edu>
- Allport, G.W. (1937). *Personality: a psychological interpretation*. New York: Holt Rienhart.
- Ashford, E. (2011). *Retiring presidents offer advice for those new to the role*. American Community College Times. American Association of Community Colleges. Retrieved February 2011 from <http://www.communitycollegetimes.com>
- Avolio, B.J., & Bass, B.M. (2004). The multifactor leadership questionnaire. Retrieved from www.mindgarden.com. 3/17/2010
- Avolio, B.J., Bass, B.M., & Jung, D.I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the multifactor leadership questionnaire, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72, 441-463.
- Baker, G.A. (1994). *A handbook on the community college in America: Its history, mission, and management*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). Bass and Stogdill's handbook on leadership, theory, research and managerial applications (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1997). The Ethics of Transformational Leadership." In *Kellogg Leadership Studies Project, Transformational Leadership Working Papers* . College Park, MD: The James MacGregor Burns Academy of Leadership.

- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B.J. (1993). Transformational leadership: A response to critiques. In M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds) *Leadership Theory and Research: Perspectives and Directions* (pp. 49-80). New York: Academic Press.
- Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B.J. (1997). *Revised Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*, Palo Alto, CA: Mind Garden.
- Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2008). *The handbook of leadership: Theory, research and managerial applications*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bennis, W. (1990). *On becoming a leader*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Bensimon, E., Neuman, A., & Birnbaum, R.C. (1989). *Making sense of administrative leadership: The “L” word in higher education*. Washington, DC. (ASHE – ERIC, Higher Education Report No.1 ED316074MF-01: PC-05). The George Washington University Graduate School of Education and Human Development.
- Birnbaum, R. C. (1992). *How Academic Leadership Works: Understanding Success and Failure in the College Presidency* (Jossey Bass Higher and Adult Education Series). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Bolman, L.G., & Deal, T.E. (1992). Reframing leadership: The effects of leaders’ images of leadership. In K. E. Clark, M. B. Clark, & D. P. Campbell (Eds.), *Impact of leadership* (pp. 269). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Boyd, D. (2002). *State spending for higher education in the coming decade*. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education.
- Bray, D.W., Campbell, R.J., & Grant, D.L. (1974). *Formative years in business: A long-term AT&T study of managerial lives*. New York: Wiley.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row

- Bycio, P., Hackett, R.D., & Allen, J.S. (1995). Further assessment of Bass's (1995) Conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 80, 468-478.
- Carlye, T. (1840). Chapter VI. *The Hero as King. Cromwell, Napoleon: Modern Revolutionism*. Retrieved on February 2007 from <http://www.readprint.com/chapter-19737/Heroes-and-Hero-Worship>.
- Cohen, A., & Brawer, F.B. (2003). *The American community college* (2nd ed). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Davis, J. (2003). *Learning to lead*. Westport, CT: American Council of Education/Praeger.
- Day, D.V. & Lord, R.G. (1988). Executive leadership and organizational performance: Suggestions for a new theory and methodology. *Journal of Management*, 14, 453-464.
- Duree, C. (2007). *The challenge of community college presidency in the new millennium: Characteristics, traits, skills, preparation. Pathways and leadership programs needed to survive*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University: Ames, IO.
- DePree, M. (1989). *Leadership is an art*. New York: Dell.
- Dunham, R.B. (1984). *Organizational Behavior*: Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin.
- Eddy, L.P. & K.E. VanDerliden, (2006). Emerging definitions of leadership in higher education: New Visions of leadership or same old "hero" leader? *Community College Review*. 1, 5-20.
- Ehrle, E.B., & Bennett, J.B. (1988). *Managing the academic enterprise*. New York: MacMillan.
- Evelyn, J. (2001, April 16). Community colleges face crisis of leadership. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, A36-A38.
- Fiedler, F.E. (1984). *Leadership experience and performance*. Arlington, VA: United States Army Research Institute for Behavioral Performance.

- Fiedler, F.E. (1964). *A contingency model of leadership effectiveness*. In L. Berkowitz (ed).
Advance in experimental social psychology, New York: *Academic Press*.
- Fiedler, F.E., & Garcia, E. (1987). *New approaches to effective leadership*: Arlington, VA:
United States Army Research Institute for Behavioral performance.
- Fleishman, E.A., Munford, M.D., Zaccaro, S.J., Levin, K.Y., Kortin, A.S., & Hein, M.B.
(1991).Taxonomic efforts in the description of leader behavior. A synthesis and
functional interpretation. *Leadership Quarterly*, 2, 245-281.
- Floyd, D. L. (1992). Career Services in community colleges. In D. H. Montross & C. J.
Shinkman (Eds.), *Career Development in the 1990s*. (pp. 91-104). New York: Charles C
Thomas Publishing.
- Fowler, J. F. (1989). *Survey research methods*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Galton, F. (1869). *Heredity genius an inquiry into its laws and consequences*. New York:
Macmillan and Co. Retrieved on February 2007 from
[http://www.mugu.com/galton/Books heredity-genius/text/htm/galton-4869-genius.html](http://www.mugu.com/galton/Books%20heredity-genius/text/htm/galton-4869-genius.html)
- Gay, L. R. (1996). *Educational research competencies for analysis and application* (5th ed.).
Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Gratton, M. (1993). Leadership in learning organizations. *New Directions for community
colleges. Academe*, 88(4), 27-31.
- Green, J. & Levine, A. (1985). *Opportunity in adversity: How colleges can succeed in hard
times*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Green, M. S. (1994). Not for cowards or wimps: Leadership in the post-heroic age. *Educational
Record*, 61(N3), 55-60
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant Leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and
greatness*. New York: Prentice Hall.

- Helgesen, S. (2005). *The web of inclusion: A new architecture for building great organizations*. Frederick, MD: Beard Books.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K.H. (1974). So you want to know your leadership style. *Training and Development Journal*, 28(2), 22-37.
- Hocking, W.E. (1924). Leaders and lead. *Yale Review*, 13, 625-641.
- House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. IN J. G. Hunt & S. L. Larson (Eds), *Leadership: The cutting edge*. (pp 198-207. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Howard, A., & Bray, D. W. (1988). *Managerial lives in transition: Advancing age and changing times*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Hunt, J. G. (1981). *Leadership: A new synthesis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Jacobs, T. O., & Jacques, E. (1987). Leadership in complex systems. In J. Zeidner (Ed.), *Human productivity enhancements*. New York: Prager.
- Jeffery, D. (2008). *A multiple case study of community college presidents: Perceptions of leadership demands and competencies*. Unpublished Dissertation. University of Idaho, Moscow, ID.
- Jennings, E. (1960). *Anatomy of leadership. Princesses, hero and superman*. New York: McGraw Hill Publishers.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (2nd ed). New York: Wiley.
- Kauffman, J. (1980). *At the pleasure of the board*. Washington, DC: American Council of Education.
- Kelly, R. E. (1998). In praise of followers. IN W. Rosenback & R. L. Taylor (Eds.) *Contemporary Issues in Leadership* (4th ed, 96 – 106). Boulder, CO: Westview.

- Levine, A. & Cureton, J.C. (1998). *When Hope and Fear Collide: A Portrait of Today's College Student*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Lewin, K. (1958). *Group Decision and social change*. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Lewis, M. D. (1989). *Effective leadership strategies for the community college president*. . Long Beach City College. ERIC Document ED 307 948.
- Likert, R. (1932). *A technique for measurement of attitudes*. Unpublished Dissertation. Columbia University, New York.
- Likert, R. (1961). *New Patterns of Management*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Lucey, C. A. (2002). Civic engagement, shared governance, and community colleges. *Academe*, 88(4), 27-31.
- MacTaggart, T. J. (1994). *Improving system-campus relations: Seven principles*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Higher Education, Chicago, IL.
- Maslow, A.J. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Maxcy, S.J. (1994). *Postmodern school leadership: Meeting the crisis in educational administration*. Santa Barbara, CA: Prager.
- McBride, H. (2002). The academic pipeline is a choice, not an obligation, *Science: Next Wave*, July 19, Retrieved 11/09/2009 from <http://advancingwomen.com/awlwordpress/>
- McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw Hill Higher Education.
- Munford, E. (1909). *The origins of leadership*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Myers, V. (2012). Leaning on community colleges. *On Campus. The National Publication of AFT Higher Education Faculty and Professional Staff*. 31(3), 8-11. Retrieved from http://www.aft.org/pdfs/oncampus/oc_janfeb12.pdf

- Neumann, A., & Bensimon (1990). Constructing the presidency: College presidents image of their leadership roles a comparative study. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 61(6), 678 – 701.
- Northouse, P.G. (2004). *Leadership theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing Ltd.
- O'Bannon, T. (1997). *A learning college of the 21st century*. Phoenix, AZ: American Council of Education Oryx Press on Higher Education.
- Oppenheim, A.N. (1992). *Questionnaire design, interviewing and attitude measurement*. New York: Pinter Publishers.
- Parnell, D. (1989). Major restraints on grand opportunities. *Community College Journal*, 51, 44-48.
- Peterson, M. (1979). *Using contextual planning and management for a changing environment*. (127-157). San Francisco. Jossey-Bass.
- Pruijn, G., & Boucher, R.L. (1994). The relationship of transactional and transformational Leadership to organizational effectiveness of Dutch national sports organizations. *European journal of sports management*, 2(1):72-87.
- Rogers, C. (1980). *A way of being*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Roueche, J. E., Baker, G. A., & Rose, R. R. (1989). *Shared vision: Transformational leadership in American community colleges*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.
- Rowley, D.J., & Sherman, H. (2001). *From strategy to change: Implementing the plan in higher education*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Schon, D.A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schultz, C. (2001). *The critical impact of impending retirements of community college leadership*. Washington DC: American Association Community College Press.

- Sekaran, U. (1992). *Research methods for business: A skills building approach* (2nd Ed). New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Shak, A.J., & Moahan, M.L. (2008). The leadership styles in academia: Four faces of university presidents. *American Association of International Journal of Management* 2(2), 81-91.
- Stodgill, R.M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership. A survey of theory and research*. New York: Free Press.
- Stogdill, R. M. & Coons. A. E. (Eds). (1957). *Leader Behavior: Description and Measurement*. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Bureau of Business Research Monograph No.88.
- Tucker, M.L., Bass, B.M. & Daniel, L.G. (1992). Transformational leaderships impact on higher education satisfaction, effectiveness and extra efforts. In K. E. Clark, M. B. Clark, & D. F. Campbell (Eds.), *Impact on leadership*, (pp.170-175). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Vaughan, G. B. (1986a). *Leadership transition: The community college presidency*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education Oryx Press Series on Higher Education.
- Vaughan, G. B. (1986b). *The community college presidency*. New York: Macmillan.
- Vaughan, G. (1989). *Leadership in transition: The community college presidency*. Macmillan Series on Higher Education. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Vaughan, G. B., & Weisman, I. M. (1985). *The community college presidency at the millennium*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.
- Vroom, V. H. & Jago, A. G. (1974). Decision making as a social process: Normative and descriptive models of leader behavior. *Decision Sciences*, 5, 743-769.
- Weber, M. (1949). "Objectively" in social science and social policy. E.A. Shils & H.A. Finch (eds.) *In the methodology of the social sciences*. New York: Free Press.

- Weisman, I. M., & Vaughan, G. B. (2002). *The community college presidency, 2001 ACC Research Brief*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Weisman, I. M., & Vaughan, G. B. (2006). *The community college presidency, 2006 ACCC, Executive Summary*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges
- Wenrich, J. W. (1980). Can the president be all things to all people? *Community College Journal*, 48(7) 68.
- Whitelaw, P. (2001). (November). Reliability and validity: The terrible twins of good research. In 360 degree Feedback: News letter of the accredited MLQ Network. Melbourne: MLQ Leadership Services Pty. Ltd. 360 degree.
- Yukl, G. A. (1994). *Leadership in organizations*. Upper Saddle Rivers, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Zaccaro, S. J., & Klimoski, R. J. (2001). *The nature of organizational leadership and introduction*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

ABSTRACT**AN EXAMINATION OF MIDWEST COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PRESIDENTS' LEADERSHIP STYLES**

by

MARVIN JONES JACOBS

August 2012

Advisor: Dr. Monty Piliawsky**Major:** Educational Leadership and Policy Studies**Degree:** Doctor of Education

This study examined the leadership styles of community college presidents and chancellors in the Midwestern part of the United States on leadership styles they embraced based on their personal characteristics, age, gender, education and experience in higher education, location, and other prevailing personal characteristics. The three leadership styles measured in the study were transformational, transactional and passive avoidant. Three research questions were posed for the study.

A total of 176 presidents in five states were sent surveys. Of this number, 82 (46.6%) completed and returned the MLQ questionnaire and the investigator-developed demographic survey. Survey findings suggested participating presidents appeared to favor a transformational leadership style, with the passive avoidant styles least preferred. Comparison on the three leadership styles by size of the student body for each president was not statistically significant. College demographics were not statistically significant as a predictor of transformational, transactional, or passive avoidant leadership styles. Conversely, years employed in higher education was a statically significant predictor of transformational leadership styles. Community college presidents who had been in higher education for longer periods of time had less positive

perceptions of transformational leadership styles. Years employed in a community college and gender were statistically significant predictors of passive avoidant leadership styles. The longer community college presidents were employed in a community college the less they favored a passive avoidant leadership style. Findings also suggested that female community college presidents were more likely to have higher scores for passive avoidant leadership styles.

The findings of this study supported the argument to begin community college leadership training early. Community college boards and stakeholders need to implement programs for community college educators interested in leadership positions. These boards need to be aware of the type of leadership styles that are most desirable when making hiring decisions. Faced with impending retirements within the ranks of current community college presidents, these programs could serve a vital role in identifying qualified applicants for pending vacancies.

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENT

Marvin Jones Jacobs

Education

Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan
2011 – Doctor of Education
Major: Educational Leadership and Policy Studies

2001 – Education Specialist
Major: Educational Leadership

Marygrove College, Detroit, Michigan
1993 – Masters of Arts
Major: Human Resource Management

Mississippi Valley State University, Itta Bena, Mississippi
1973 – Bachelor of Science
Major: Social Science, Teacher Education

Professional Experience

1993 – Present
Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan
Career Development Counselor

1989 to 1993
Detroit Job Corps, Detroit, Michigan
Intervention Counselor,

1981 to 1989
Mount Carmel Mercy Hospital, Detroit, Michigan
Human Resource Employment Interviewer

1977 to 1981
Detroit, Urban League, Detroit, Michigan
Project Director

Professional Memberships

Professional Michigan Career Development Association
National Career Development Association
Michigan Counseling Association

Honors and Awards

Fully Funded Undergraduate Scholarship - Music